DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 344 HE 025 319

TITLE	Hearing on the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965: Early Intervention. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred Second Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	15 May 91
NOTE	149p.; Serial No. 102-37. Portions contain small/marginally legible print. For related documents, see HE 025 317-320.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; Admissions Counseling; College Admission; Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Legislation; *Equal Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Higher Education; Intermediate Grades; Outreach Programs; Paying for College; Secondary Education; Student Financial Aid; Student Loan Programs; Student Needs; Tuition
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 102nd; *Higher Education Act 1965

ABSTRACT

This document presents tetimony and prepared statements concerning three pieces of legislation which seek to increase early intervention and outreach activities designed to inform students and their families about postsecondary education and student financial assistance options. The legislation provides for technical assistance to guidance counselors, highlights model counseling programs across the country, and ensures dissemination of information on postsecondary educational opportunities. Among those prsenting testimony are the following: Daniel Saracino, Dean of Admissions, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, California; Paula Martin, Executive Director, the East Harlem College and Counseling Program, New York, New York; Cornelius Foley, President, State of New York Higher Education Services Corporation; and Eleanor Chelimsky, Assistant Comptroller General, Programs Evaluation and Methodology Division, General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C. Prepared statements are presented from several of these witnesses, from members of Congress, and from the following persons: Kristine MacDermott, Assistant Provost, Enrollment Management, University of Akron, Ohio; John Jensen, President, HEP/CAMP Association, Boise State University, Boise, Idaho; and Arnoldo Rodriguez, Principal, McAllen, Texas. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342344

HEARING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965: EARLY INTERVENTION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MAY 15, 1991

Serial No. 102-37

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 025 319

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

46-807 ==

WASHINGTON : 1991

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
CRAIG A. WASHINGTON, Texas
JOSÉ E. SERRANO, New York
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT A. ANDREWS, New Jersey
WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Louisiana
JOHN F. REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
JAIME B. FUSTER, Puerto Rico

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
SCOTT L. KLUG, Wisconsin
MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma

PATRICIA F. RISSLER, *Staff Director*
ANDREW J. HARTMAN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
GEORGE MILLER, California
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
CRAIG A. WASHINGTON, Texas
JOSÉ E. SERRANO, New York
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT A. ANDREWS, New Jersey
WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Louisiana
JOHN F. REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
DALE KILDEE, Michigan

E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
SCOTT L. KLUG, Wisconsin
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, DC, May 15, 1991	1
Text of H.R. 763	128
Text of H.R. 1524	135
Statement of:	
Ford, Hon. Harold E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Tennessee	4
Saracino, Daniel, Dean of Admissions, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA; Paula Martin, Executive Director, the East Harlem College and Career Counseling Program, New York, NY; Eleanor Chelimsky, Assistant Comptroller General, Programs Evaluation and Methodology Division, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC; accompanied by Fritz Mulhauser, Assistant Director, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC; and Kathleen White, Project Manager, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC; Cornelius Foley, President, State of New York Higher Education Services Corporation, Albany, NY; Kristine MacDermott, Assistant Provost, Enrollment Management, University of Akron, Akron, OH; Arnoldo Rodriguez, Principal, McAllen, TX; and John Jenson, President, HEP/CAMP Association, Boise State University, Boise, ID	19
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Chelimsky, Eleanor, Assistant Comptroller General, Programs Evaluation and Methodology Division, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC, prepared statement of	51
Coleman, Hon. E. Thomas, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri, prepared statement of	17
Foley, Cornelius, President, State of New York Higher Education Services Corporation, Albany, NY, prepared statement of	75
Ford, Hon. Harold E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Tennessee, prepared statement of	7
Ford, Hon. William D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan, prepared statement of	3
Gaydos, Hon. Joseph M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, prepared statement of	3
Jenson, John, President, HEP/CAMP Association, Boise State University, Boise, ID, prepared statement of	109
Lowey, Hon. Nita M., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York:	
Bill summary	127
Prepared statement of	13
MacDermott, Kristine, Assistant Provost, Enrollment Management, University of Akron, Akron, OH, prepared statement of	86
Martin, Paula, Executive Director, the East Harlem College and Career Counseling Program, New York, NY, prepared statement of	38
Payne, Hon. Donald M., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey, prepared statement of	4
Rodriguez, Arnoldo, Principal, McAllen, TX, prepared statement of	97
Saracino, Daniel, Dean of Admissions, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA, prepared statement of	23
Serrano, Hon. José E., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of	3

HEARING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1991

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:30 a.m., Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Thomas Sawyer [Acting Chairman] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Ford, Hayes, Miller, Lowey, Sawyer, Andrews, Reed, Kildee, Coleman, Roukema, Gunderson, and Barrett.

Staff present: Thomas Wolanin, staff director; Jack Jennings, education counsel; Maureen Long, legislative associate/clerk; Gloria Gray-Watson, administrative assistant; and Jo-Marie St. Martin, education counsel, minority.

Mr. SAWYER. [presiding] I am pleased, on behalf of Chairman Ford, to convene the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education this morning for this 10th hearing in a series of 44 on the Reauthorization Act. Today, our panel of witnesses will address the topic of early intervention and outreach to inform students and their families about postsecondary education and student financial assistance options.

We will hear testimony on three pieces of legislation which seek to increase that intervention and student awareness. H.R. 1524, which I introduced to provide technical assistance to guidance counselors, to highlight model counseling programs across the country, and to ensure dissemination of information on postsecondary educational opportunities.

Congresswoman Nita Lowey will be introducing legislation today entitled "The National Liberty Scholarship and Partnership Act," which would provide a combination of early intervention services and a scholarship incentive to ensure students that financial need will not be an obstacle for postsecondary opportunities.

And our colleague, Harold Ford from Tennessee, will appear before us today as our first witness to discuss his legislation, H.R. 763, the Chance to Go to College Act. This particular piece of legislation is designed to work in the high schools with parents and students to provide information and guidance on college preparation. Students in selected high schools would be eligible for significant amounts of financial assistance, as a product of this particular measure.

Just let me say a couple words about this entire subject. One of the biggest changes that we face in postsecondary settings is the change in the age of incoming students. Since 1980, some 60 percent of the women are over age 25, and 30 percent of the men, are over age 25. In addition to that, not only do these kinds of studies tell us who is coming to college, the new populations, but who isn't.

And what I'm concerned about is the 17- and 18-year-old traditional students who are not getting to college. I suspect that a lot of them don't go to college simply because they don't believe they can. They've never heard of financial aid. They're not aware of Pell grants or Stafford loans. They overestimate the cost. They have incorrect ideas about eligibility. And as a result, they wind up not taking the necessary courses in time, and some, as a result of that, don't even finish high school.

Our goal is to create opportunities not only to provide information, but to intervene early when it will do the most good. It's too late to wait until a kid is close to graduating before we deal with higher education. So it is with that in mind that I'm particularly pleased to have the opportunity to hear the comments and suggestions of our witnesses on this particular, important topic. Lack of information just simply shouldn't be a barrier to postsecondary education.

Mrs. Roukema, do you have a comment you would like to make?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Thank you, Mr. Acting Chairman. I don't have an opening statement. I simply want to indicate, to our colleague who is testifying today and to the rest of the panel that my presence here, even for a short time, is an indication of my interest in this particular aspect of higher education. As a former secondary school teacher, I certainly understand that you all are right on target in understanding that early intervention is essential for ultimate success.

I will apologize and I hope you will understand that it is not lack of interest that will require me to leave shortly, because, as the ranking member on the Housing Subcommittee, I must be there for an oversight hearing on GSEs, which also has some relevance to our own committee's responsibilities with respect to Sally Mae.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm eager to hear the panel and our colleague, Mr. Ford.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you very much. I appreciate your timely presence here. And it's important to recognize that the Democratic caucus and the Republican conference are going on at precisely this time, and it is not lack of interest in this topic that has limited the number of members present this morning.

With that in mind, without objection, I will insert in the appropriate place in the record the opening statement of Joe Gaydos on this particular topic, and any other members who submit their comments.

[The prepared statements of Hon. William D. Ford, Hon. Joseph M. Gaydos Hon. Jose E. Serrano, and Hon. Donald M. Payne follow:]

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM D. FORD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

I am pleased to convene this Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education for this 10th hearing in a series of 44 on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Today, our distinguished panels of witnesses will address the topic of early intervention and outreach in informing students and families about postsecondary education and student financial assistance options.

We will hear testimony on three pieces of legislation which seek to increase early intervention and student awareness. H.R. 1524, "The Student Counseling and Assistance Network Act of 1991," was introduced by Tom Sawyer to provide technical assistance to guidance counselors, to highlight model counseling programs and to ensure dissemination of information on postsecondary education and financial assistance opportunities.

Nita Lowey will be introducing legislation today entitled "The National Liberty Scholarship and Partnership Act," which would provide a combination of early intervention services and a scholarship incentive to ensure students that financial need will not be an obstacle for postsecondary education.

And Harold Ford from Tennessee will appear before us today to discuss his legislation, H.R. 763, the "Chance To Go To College Act." This legislation is designed to work in the high schools with parents and students to provide information and guidance on college preparation. Students in selected high schools would be eligible for significant scholarship support.

I look forward to hearing the comments and suggestions of our witnesses on this important topic. Lack of information about student financial assistance should not be a barrier to postsecondary education.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

If there is one constant theme in education, it is early intervention—getting to students before it is too late.

Students, parents, teachers, and academic advisors agree that if we are to reach those students who could benefit the most from postsecondary study, we must get to them as early as possible.

In the past, it seemed sufficient to focus on high school age students, telling them about the opportunities for higher education, about the different forms of financial assistance available, and so on.

Today, experts say we can't wait that long. We must tell students in middle school that higher education can be a reality for them—first, to give them opportunity to take those high school courses that will help them get accepted at and succeed in college, and, second to urge them to stay in school until they get their high school diplomas.

Because of changes we made last year during the budget reconciliation process, students who drop out of high school are ineligible for any of the higher education assistance programs until they pass a high school equivalency test.

If we are to have the skilled and well-qualified workforce we need, we must keep all of the doors to our higher education system open wide and early intervention is critical.

Unfortunately, many students decide before they leave middle school that college is not for them because their families could not meet the astronomical costs. We must reach these students before they make this decision. We can't afford not to.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSE E. SERRANO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, I would like to welcome Mr. Ford, sponsor of the Chance To Go To College Act. I am happy to be an original sponsor of this bill that addresses the critical need for such early intervention programs that we will be discussing today. In America, going to college should no longer be a dream, but a priority.

Access, support, and determination are the keys to success for our students to get through college.

I would also like to congratulate Mrs. Lowey on her Liberty Scholarship and Partnership Act, which I am happy to be an original sponsor of. I applaud Mr. Sawyers efforts to promote the dissemination of early intervention counseling and financial aid programs to increase access by all students to higher education. I look forward

to working with my colleagues to ensure that all children in America understand that going to college is an available reality.

I look forward to listening to the discussion of our distinguished panelists.

STATEMENT OF HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Chairman, let me commend you for calling this hearing on the importance of early intervention programs.

If we truly believe that all students should have access to a postsecondary education, then we must support Title IV of the act, which assist in making available the benefits of postsecondary education to eligible students by providing, basic educational opportunity grants and by providing special projects and programs to encourage disadvantaged youth to attend college and provide remedial services to students who need the extra assistance to attend college.

I would like to welcome all the witnesses, especially my good friend and colleague, Harold Ford, who is the main sponsor of H.R. 763, The Chance to Go to College Program. I support this bill and I am a cosponsor.

Additionally, I would like to commend the efforts of my colleague, Nita Lowey for her National Liberty Scholarship and Partnership Act, which provides early intervention services and guarantees that cost will not be a barrier to attending college. Also, I support the efforts of my colleague, Tom Sawyer, whose bill will promote increased access to higher education through early intervention counseling and financial aid information and I am a cosponsor of both of these bills.

I look forward to hearing more about these programs.

Mr. SAWYER. With that, let me call on our first panel. The witness will be our colleague, Honorable Harold E. Ford of Tennessee.

STATEMENT OF HONORABLE HAROLD E. FORD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. FORD OF TENNESSEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. I would like to personally thank you and members of this committee for giving me an opportunity to testify before the committee on H.R. 763, The Chance to Go to College Act, as part of your ongoing series of hearings on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that I do, in fact, support your bill, H.R. 1524. I have not studied the bill that will be dropped into the hopper today by Mrs. Lowey, but I certainly support the concept, and I'm sure once we are privy to the bill, itself, that we will embrace that legislation.

And, hopefully, all three bills at some point can find a way to merge and bring out a significant piece of legislation that would, in fact, move forward when we talk about early intervention as well as the National Liberty Scholarship Fund, along with the guaranteed component, which is in my bill, to make sure that A Chance to Go to College would have the appropriate financing.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, a college degree can often open a lot of doors to economic security. In 1991, the gap in salaries for a 30-year-old man with a high school degree and one with a college degree is 50 percent. Over the past 10 years, the cost of attending a private university grew from 59.5 percent, while the national per capita income grew by only 18 percent.

In 1991, Mr. Chairman, a college degree is a crucial asset that is unavailable to many at-risk students throughout this nation. We're well aware of that. And I think that the legislation that I'm testifying on today would go to make a pilot program and show the trends and demonstrate what is needed in this country today.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to say, for the record, that we have an opportunity now to put in place legislation that would address many of the problems that our at-risk students, in urban areas as well as rural areas in this nation, are faced with.

Too many students do not know what they must do to graduate from high school with the required courses, like you just said earlier, Mr. Chairman. And I think that that is one of the key problems that students are faced with, especially at-risk students. Too many students are not aware of the substantial financial assistance available to them, 73 percent of which comes from the Federal Government programs that exist today, but they're unaware.

You mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, when maybe they are aware of these different programs, it is too late, because certain requirements in high school courses were not obtained, and therefore, they're denied access to acceptance in many of the colleges and universities.

For these students, the dream of college is a dream deferred. Early intervention programs combined with financial assistance can make the dream of postsecondary education a reality for high-risk students in this nation.

H.R. 763, the Chance to Go to College Act, would create comprehensive scholarship programs for at-risk youth operated and coordinated by the Federal Government. And I'm sure that it can be combined with the legislation that you are the author of, as well as other legislation that's already in the hopper.

Mr. Chairman, these sponsorship programs would be located in 50 high schools throughout the country and would combine early intervention education programs with financial grants of up to $25,000 for postsecondary education. The Chance to Go to College Act would include schools that are located in areas with high concentrations of poverty, and schools that demonstrate parental involvement, tutoring, and role model programs, and provide exposure to college that will be given special consideration to the selection process.

Graduating students who would otherwise qualify for a Pell grant would be awarded up to $25,000 in scholarships to use at institutions of higher education. If a student's cost of attendance is less than the $25,000 that we put in this bill, Mr. Chairman, over the 4 year period, the grant will be reduced accordingly.

In addition to providing early intervention programs and financial grants to at-risk students around the country, the Chance to Go to College Act would test the success rates of the comprehensive scholarship programs operated by the Federal Government as compared to scholarship programs operated by private individuals and corporations.

We in the Congress are often prevented from creating progressive strategies because of the budget deficit, Mr. Chairman. By combining early intervention programs with financial assistance, we can get more of the bang out of the buck, and that's what we need in 1991 and the years to come.

If the Federal Government can operate successful scholarship programs that combine these two components of educational support for at-risk students, we could expand our services at relatively little cost, Mr. Chairman. The Chance to Go to College program

would test a new method of combining Federal education services to at-risk students and, if successful, help us reach more students at a relatively inexpensive cost.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that the Chance to Go to College Act does not attempt to test the effectiveness of early intervention programs; the positive effect of these programs are well-documented, and we know it. This is to complement and to guarantee that type of assistance that is needed up and above what might be there with Pell grants and loan programs that we already have in existence. Instead, H.R. 763 would test a new form of Federal assistance that combines the power of early intervention with a guarantee of financial assistance.

Before I close, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am familiar with, once again, your bill and Mrs. Lowey's bill, and plan in every way to give strong support to the two bills that are before the hopper.

And I would be willing to work with you and other members of this committee in merging the three bills and coming with a component that would be good and one that we could pass in this particular Congress and say to those at-risk students throughout this country that we in the Congress, will give whatever protection is needed in order to guarantee early intervention, as well as if states want to come in and participate, as Mrs. Lowey's bill is presenting in the National Liberty Scholarship Fund, along with the guaranteed demonstration program that would say that we could look at the trends in the months and years to come, and hopefully, at least, make an attempt to solve many of the problems that are out there.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for your consideration on H.R. 763, the Chance to Go to College Act, and I will close at this time. And if there are any questions from my colleagues or from the committee, I would be happy to try to respond to them.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Harold E. Ford follows:]

HAROLD E. FORD
9TH DISTRICT, TENNESSEE

COMMITTEES
WAYS AND MEANS

CHAIRMAN
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES

DEMOCRATIC STEERING AND
POLICY COMMITTEE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

MEMPHIS OFFICES
167 NORTH MAIN STREET
FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, SUITE 369
(901) 544-4131

193 WEST MITCHELL ROAD
(901) 544-4141

2305 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3265

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE HAROLD E. FORD (D-TN)

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

MAY 15, 1991

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the members of your committee for inviting me to testify on H.R. 763, the Chance to Go to College Act, as part of your ongoing series of hearings on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, a college degree can open a lot of doors to economic security. In 1991, the gap in salaries for a thirty-year-old man with a high school degree and one with a college degree is 50 percent.

And over the last ten years, the cost of attending a private university grew by 59.5 percent, while the national per capita income grew by only 18 percent.

In 1991, a college degree is a crucial asset that is unavailable to many at-risk students throughout the nation.

Too many students do not know what they must do to graduate from high school with the required courses to matriculate at American colleges, and too many students are not aware of the substantial financial assistance available to them, 73 percent of which comes from the federal government.

For these students, the dream of college is a dream deferred. Early intervention programs, combined with financial assistance, can make the dream of postsecondary education a reality for at-risk students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

H.R. 763, the Chance to Go to College Act, would create comprehensive sponsorship programs for at-risk youth operated and coordinated by the federal government.

These sponsorship programs would be located in fifty high schools throughout the country, and would combine early intervention education programs with financial grants of up to $25,000 for postsecondary education.

The Chance to Go to College Act would include schools that are located in areas with high concentrations of poverty, and schools that demonstrate parental involvement, tutoring and role model programs, and provide exposure to college will be given special consideration in the selection process.

Graduating students who would otherwise qualify for a Pell grant will be awarded up to $25,000 in scholarships to use at institutions of higher education. If a student's cost of attendance is less than $25,000 over a four year period, the grant will be reduced accordingly.

In addition to providing early intervention programs and financial grants to at-risk students around the country, the Chance to Go to College Act would test the success rates of the comprehensive sponsorship programs operated by the federal government as compared to sponsorship programs operated by private individuals and corporations.

We in the Congress are often prevented from creating progressive strategies because of the budget deficit. By combining early intervention programs with financial assistance, we can get more bang for our bucks.

If the federal government can operate successful sponsorship programs that combine these two components of educational support for at-risk students, we could expand our services at relatively little cost.

The Chance to Go to College program would test a new method of combining federal education services to at-risk youth, and -- if successful -- help us reach more students at a relatively inexpensive cost.

Mr. Chairman, <u>I wish to emphasize that the Chance to Go to College Act does not attempt to test the effectiveness of early intervention programs; the positive effects of these service programs are well-documented.</u> Instead, H.R 763 would test a new form of federal assistance that combines the power of early intervention with a guarantee of financial assistance.

Before I close, I would like to say that I am familiar with H.R. 1524, Mr. Sawyer's bill, and Ms. Lowey's Liberty scholarships bill to be introduced today. I would be pleased to work with both Mr. Sawyer and Ms. Lowey to craft the best early intervention and financial assistance law possible.

Mr. Chairman, once again let me thank you for the opportunity to testify before your committee. I would also like to thank Mr. Hayes, Ms. Unsoeld, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Washington for their co-sponsorship of the bill. Thank you for your consideration of H.R. 763, the Chance to Go to College Act.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you very much, Congressman Ford. Your approach is certainly not in competition or conflict with any of the approaches that any of us have talked about and is an effective complement to much of what we're trying to do.

Let me note the arrival of a couple of colleagues, and inquire whether Mrs. Lowey has any comments or questions that you have for Congressman Ford.

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you very much. And I apologize, Mr. Chairman, for being detained at another meeting. And I think what I will do is enter my opening statement in the record.

Mr. SAWYER. Without objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. I just want to welcome my colleague here today. And I appreciate the fact that you want to work with both my colleague Mr. Sawyer and myself in making this the very best bill we can. I know your bill also has its roots in Eugene Lang's I Have A Dream program.

Eugene Lang has been a neighbor of mine, in fact, we've known each other for more than 30 years. And I think this program has really made a major difference. What was so important about his program is not so much that it provided just resources, but that there was a commitment to working with these youngsters early, to make sure that these youngsters would have that dream, and then give them the resources to fulfill that dream.

And that's what your program does, that's what mine does, and, certainly, my colleague Mr. Sawyer's does—is help the youngsters early to have that dream, intervene early, and work with them though mentoring, tutoring, and counseling, to help them realize that the way they can participate in our society, the way they can be productive, is to work hard, go to school, and then guarantee them that, because of the limits of their background of their families, they will not have an obstacle preventing them from getting that education.

But so many of our youngsters start out never even thinking that college is possible. So that's why the early intervention is so important, the information is so important. We must give these youngsters the feeling that they can do it, and if they can do it, lack of money is not going to stop them.

So I'm very enthusiastic about your program, and I look forward to working closely with you and my colleagues in making sure that our dream of ensuring that in the United States of America in 1991, that no child will be limited from fulfilling their dream because of the dollar, because of income.

I know that yours, Mr. Ford, is a demonstration program. If we could change our priorities in this body, to what extent would you like to expand it? I know that you and I agree about the potential of this program, and I wondered to what extent would you see this program expanding and to what extent would you like to invest even greater resources in this program?

Mr. FORD OF TENNESSEE. You know, in the early stage of drafting this bill, Mrs. Lowey, we only had a pilot program for five schools, and it was after talking with members and the staff of this committee and others around the country that it was decided that we would talk about one school for each state.

Budget-wise, or from a fiscal perspective, I don't know. I would leave that up to the committee here and the full committee to determine whether or not we should expand and go beyond the demonstration component of this bill with 50 schools.

Certainly, I am very much in support of the legislation that you are introducing, and I want to go on that particular bill. One of the things that we wanted to see in this particular bill, here, is that I'm not sure that my state and other Southern states would have come on board right away with your bill.

And therefore, if we had some trends to look at to see the impact of the guaranteed financial aspect of it—once that early intervention is really triggered in and we can see that everyone would have that opportunity to go to college, and it goes up and above the Pell grants that students who might not be totally aware of all of the loan programs that are available—if we want to exceed the demonstration 50 schools here, that's fine, but I would leave it up to the committee in saying that we would have to look at it from a fiscal standpoint.

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you, and I appreciate you comment that although your bill didn't include state involvement, you certainly are supportive of state involvement.

Mr. FORD OF TENNESSEE. Very much so.

Mrs. LOWEY. Because I think it's so important to maximize our dollars. And in some states, they really have shown some initiative—such as New York—and they are very aggressive in providing assistance to students. So if we can build on these programs and maximize our dollars, certainly, in these difficult times—while my colleague, Mr. Sawyer and others, are changing our priorities and making sure that education comes first, we can help more and more of our children succeed.

I look forward to continuing to work with you in creating the very best program we can have for our youngsters. And I thank you very much.

Mr. FORD OF TENNESSEE. We estimate our bill with the 50 schools participating will cost about $25 million. If we go beyond that, naturally, we have to start looking at the cost. In knowing that we are working under budget restraints here in the Congress, I'm wondering whether or not that would put us in position to place the legislation in jeopardy. I would certainly not want to think so.

Hopefully we could expand, and I would be happy to work with you and other members of the committee in seeing what we can do as we try maybe to merge some of the components of all three of the pieces of legislation.

Mrs. LOWEY. I think what is most important is that all of us make it very clear that we no longer have the luxury of devoting such a small percentage of our total dollars to education. We talk about jobs being lost, we talk about competitiveness—just this morning we were talking about the possibility of losing 5,000 more jobs in a specific industry. We hear this every day in my district and your district.

And if we are not convinced that education is the key, after all the rhetoric, then I don't know how we're going to be convinced. And it's up to all of us to turn the rhetoric into results and make

this program a reality. And I look forward to working with you to do so.

Mr. FORD OF TENNESSEE. And the same is here, thank you very much.

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Nita Lowey follows:]

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE NITA M. LOWEY

HEARING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1991

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR HOLDING TODAY'S HEARING ON EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS. I AM CONVINCED THAT STRENGTHENING OUTREACH AND INTERVENTION SERVICES DURING THE HIGH SCHOOL AND MIDDLE SCHOOL YEARS IS ONE OF OUR MOST IMPORTANT TASKS DURING THIS REAUTHORIZATION PROCESS.

OUR NATION URGENTLY NEEDS WORKERS WHO ARE EDUCATED TO MEET THE ECONOMIC CHALLENGES WE WILL FACE IN THE COMING CENTURY. HOWEVER, COLLEGE ENROLLMENT OF LOW-INCOME AND MINORITY YOUTH IS DECLINING. PRECIOUS HUMAN RESOURCES ARE LOST AS THESE CHILDREN DROP OUT OF SCHOOL AND THEIR ABILITY TO SUCCEED IS SERIOUSLY DIMINISHED.

IF WE HOPE TO AVOID A SERIOUS ECONOMIC CRISIS, WE MUST ACT NOW TO ENSURE THAT MORE OF OUR STUDENTS COMPLETE COLLEGE. THERE ARE ALREADY MANY INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS TO ENCOURAGE POOR AND MINORITY YOUNGSTERS TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL AND GO ON TO COLLEGE. THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE'S RECENT STUDY OF THESE PROGRAMS FOUND THAT TWO KINDS OFFER CONSIDERABLE PROMISE: (1) COMPREHENSIVE EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS; AND (2) EARLY GUARANTEES OF STUDENT AID.

TODAY, I AM INTRODUCING A BILL, THE NATIONAL LIBERTY SCHOLARSHIP AND PARTNERSHIP ACT, WHICH WILL HELP US PROVIDE BOTH OF THESE IMPORTANT SERVICES. IN FACT, IT WILL DRAMATICALLY

CHANGE OUR APPROACH TO HIGHER EDUCATION BY PROVIDING ALL NEEDY STUDENTS WITH A VIRTUAL GUARANTEE THAT COST WILL NOT BE AN OBSTACLE TO COLLEGE ATTENDANCE.

THIS ACT IS MODELED ON INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK STATE WHICH WERE PIONEERED BY GOVERNOR CUOMO. THE BILL INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS:

- NATIONAL LIBERTY PARTNERSHIPS, PROVIDING COMPREHENSIVE EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO KEEP AT-RISK STUDENTS IN SCHOOL AND TO PREPARE THEM FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION; AND
- NATIONAL LIBERTY SCHOLARSHIPS, OFFERING "LAST DOLLAR" SCHOLARSHIP AID, IN ADDITION TO PELL GRANTS AND STATE GRANTS, TO HELP STUDENTS MEET THE FULL COSTS OF ATTENDING A PUBLIC COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY, INCLUDING TUITION, ROOM AND BOARD, BOOKS, AND OTHER COSTS. THIS AMOUNT COULD ALSO BE USED FOR THE COSTS OF ATTENDING A PRIVATE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.

ENACTMENT OF THIS BILL WOULD REPRESENT A LANDMARK CHANGE IN OUR APPROACH TO HIGHER EDUCATION. ITS COMBINATION OF ESSENTIAL SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND A TUITION GUARANTEE WILL SPUR MANY ADDITIONAL YOUTHS TO ENTER COLLEGE AND BECOME PRODUCTIVE MEMBERS OF OUR WORKFORCE. IT WILL REDUCE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH WELFARE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE, AND INCREASE OUR PRODUCTIVITY AT A TIME OF GROWING CONCERN ABOUT OUR ECONOMIC FUTURE.

I AM EXTREMELY PLEASED THAT DR. CORNELIUS FOLEY, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK STATE HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES CORPORATION, IS HERE WITH US TODAY, REPRESENTING GOVERNOR CUOMO, TO FURTHER ELABORATE ON THE ADVANTAGES OF REPLICATING THESE TYPE OF PROGRAMS

ON A NATIONWIDE BASIS. I LOOK FORWARD TO HIS TESTIMONY.

FINALLY, I WOULD LIKE TO MENTION THAT SEVERAL OF MY COLLEAGUES, INCLUDING CONGRESSMAN HAROLD FORD, AND MY COLLEAGUE MR. SAWYER, HAVE ALSO INTRODUCED EXCELLENT BILLS TO IMPROVE OUR EARLY INTERVENTION EFFORTS. IN FACT, MR. SAWYER HAS INTRODUCED THE "SCAN BILL," A PARTICULARLY PROMISING BILL WHICH I HAVE COSPONSORED. I AM HOPEFUL THAT WE CAN ALL WORK TOGETHER TO PRODUCE FINAL EARLY INTERVENTION PROVISIONS WHICH WILL PROVIDE THE BEST POSSIBLE SERVICES FOR OUR NATION'S STUDENTS. IN DOING SO, WE WILL GREATLY EXPAND OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG AMERICANS AND ENHANCE OUR NATION'S COMPETITIVENESS.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

Mr. SAWYER. Let me just add, very briefly, that when we talk about education, it seems to me, it's important to recognize, that 100 years ago we talked about entitling every kid in this country to 12 years of education if they wanted to take advantage of it. That was sufficient at a time when we were moving from farm to factory and from rural environment and an agrarian society into an urban one.

One hundred years later, I'm just not sure that that same 12 years, 180 days a year, is sufficient to meet the needs of a kid who is going to be a competitive producer in not just the American workplace but in what is a global workplace. You're right on target.

Mr. Coleman?

Mr. COLEMAN. Sorry, Mr. Ford, I wasn't here, but I'll catch up. We also have a benefactor in Kansas City, Ewing Koffman, who owns the Royals among other things, and he has presented youngsters in the inner city with the opportunity to go to college if they stay drug-free and in school—pay their way, hundreds of them. And I gather that has the same thrust as this. There are some people who have money and who want to spend it themselves, and I encourage them to do that as well.

Thank you for coming today.

Mr. FORD OF TENNESSEE. Thank you, Mr Coleman. And I must say even Mr. Koffman's partner was Mr. Fogleman, out of my home town of Memphis, and he had a similar program that all the high school students who graduated with a B average or above could go to Memphis State University free, on his account. He paid for all of the tuition costs for all of the students who graduated from the public school system. So he had a similar program.

And we do, in fact, encourage the private sector to do more of this, but at the same time, we think that the two pieces of legislation that the members of this committee have already introduced, along with this piece of legislation, that we could come out here with something that would be very significant that would complement what the private sector is doing, and even urge the private sector to do even more.

Mr. COLEMAN. Very good. Chairman Sawyer has asked if I have an opening statement. I'll delay the entire statement, but for purposes of the record, let me submit it and also emphasize this need for early intervention.

Our districts are different. In my district, we have a large rural population which is first generation college attendance and they don't know how to pursue it, in many cases. So we set up a demonstration project through a grant from the Department of Education called Access. This program incorporates high school counselors with rural youngsters and gives them access to information regarding how to apply to colleges and how to get a scholarship and financial aid. It matches them up, hopefully, with a mentor in the community who will follow that youngster and try to give them support, and hopefully, they will eventually come back to that community.

And finally, the University of Missouri has been very helpful. We will have again, for the third year, a group of 40 or 50 youngsters who have participated in a summer 1 week program at the

university, on campus. They get an actual taste of college life, and exposure to the library system, the computer system, the dorm systems, all the things available on a college campus. And all of these things have allowed some of our rural youngsters to know more about college ahead of time and they may attend college because of that.

So we're hopeful that possibly this could be something we could also build on, Mr. Chairman, providing this early intervention and information dissemination. The TRIO program has done very well in this regard, and there are a lot of good ideas. So I want to proffer the one that we've had some experience with.

I thank you for that opportunity.

[The prepared statement of Hon. E. Thomas Coleman follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. Chairman, I join you in welcoming this morning's witnesses on a topic of increasing Congressional interest, which is the need to create comprehensive Federal programs for early intervention and information dissemination for pre-high school students.

Witnesses at earlier hearings have testified about the need to inform students, at the sixth or seventh grade level, about Federal aid programs which provide access to postsecondary education opportunities. Studies indicate that few students or their parents are aware of Federal grant or loan programs, and, consequently, they all-too-often assume that higher education or postsecondary training are beyond their financial means.

Too often, these are the students who finish their formal education when they leave high school—either as a dropout, or with a high school diploma which is no longer a guarantee of more than a minimum wage job.

Clearly, the TRIO programs have done important work in encouraging disadvantaged, minority, and first generation college-bound students to pursue a college degree or seek postsecondary training. Appropriations for these programs have more than doubled in the last decade, and these programs will continue to play an important role in encouraging the completion of high school and the transition to postsecondary education.

In my northwest Missouri district, Federal funds have supported a demonstration program, designed to encourage high school students in rural communities to continue their education beyond high school and to consider careers and jobs which require advanced education and training.

For the past 3 years, Project ACCESS has provided students, teachers, and guidance counselors with information about career choices, higher education opportunities, and about Federal, State, and private sources of financial assistance.

The program has sought to match students with "mentors" in their communities, who could provide the support, guidance, and role-modeling for students in small, rural towns and school districts.

Finally, to ease the transition from school to college, ACCESS students spend a week during the summer at the University of Missouri-Columbia campus. Because of ACCESS, students in my district who never considered going to college, are now attending institutions throughout Missouri. These students have, themselves, become successful role models for their peers.

Given the number of bills already introduced in Congress, "early intervention" is an idea whose time has arrived. Clearly, we must increase the number of students in the educational pipeline. And we must take measures to insure that these students leave high school with an education which will enable them to take advantage of postsecondary opportunities.

I welcome today's witnesses and look forward to their testimony.

Mr. FORD OF TENNESSEE. Mr. Coleman, let me just have one word. I mentioned, earlier, in my statement that I represent an urban area, that's true, but the programs that we're talking about really will address many of the needs in, basically what you have said, urban as well as rural areas—and the need, whether it's the

TRIO program, or the program that's offered by Mr. Sawyer or by Mrs. Lowey, along with the bill that we are discussing now, I strongly would agree with you, the rural areas as well as urban areas.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Reed?

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to commend you and my colleague Mrs. Lowey, and Mr. Ford, for your leadership on this important issue. We can't hope or expect to have young people going on to higher education if they don't have knowledge about how to get there and, more importantly, how to pay for it.

And evidence is rapidly accumulating in field hearings—I just attended one in Washington State—that informing young people and their parents on how to get into school is critical.

I also want to reiterate the point that Mrs. Lowey made that there are states in the country now that are very receptive to a partnership with the Federal Government to provide guaranteed college educations for young people who need this type of support and who are willing to commit themselves a course of conduct that will make them good students.

In Rhode Island, we have developed the Children's Crusade, which is similar, I believe, to New York State's Liberty Program. The Children's Crusade will guarantee young people an opportunity to go to state supported institutions if they can perform academically and qualify for the institution. And I think we're reaching the point, as the Chairman suggested, that we're realizing that in order to compete in the modern world, we have to think about education extending, not through the 12th grade, but really through college and through postsecondary education.

And so the efforts of my colleagues are very much appreciated. I'm pleased to support their efforts and commend them. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you, Mr. Reed.

Mr. Barrett?

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My apologies for being late, I, too, was delayed by another meeting. At this time I don't believe I have any questions for Mr. Ford. Thank you.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Andrews?

Mr. ANDREWS. I have no questions this morning, but I appreciate Mr. Ford's efforts and his excellent insights in this regard. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Hayes?

Mr. HAYES. I have no questions either, Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend you first for the introduction of this piece of legislation. It's a necessary piece, and I want to do all I can to support it. If I have any statement, I'll submit it in writing following the hearing.

Mr. SAWYER. Without objection.

Thank you very much.

Mr. FORD OF TENNESSEE. Thank you.

Mr. SAWYER. I really appreciate your contribution this morning and the whole range of thoughtful comments. It was useful, I appreciate it. Thank you.

Our second panel this morning will consist of Daniel Saracino, Paula Martin, Eleanor Chelimsky, Cornelius Foley, Kristine Mac-

Dermott, Arnoldo Rodriguez, and John Jenson. Please join us at the table. I'll give you a few minutes to get yourselves settled.

Well, good morning and welcome to all of you. We'll hear first from Daniel Saracino who is the Dean of Admissions at Santa Clara University.

STATEMENTS OF DANIEL SARACINO, DEAN OF ADMISSIONS, SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY, SANTA CLARA, CALIFORNIA; PAULA MARTIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE EAST HARLEM COLLEGE AND CAREER COUNSELING PROGRAM, NEW YORK, NEW YORK; ELEANOR CHELIMSKY, ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER GENERAL, PROGRAMS EVALUATION AND METHODOLOGY DIVISION, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, DC; ACCOMPANIED BY FRITZ MULHAUSER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, PROGRAM EVALUATION AND METHODOLOGY DIVISION, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, DC; AND KATHLEEN WHITE, PROJECT MANAGER, PROGRAM EVALUATION AND METHODOLOGY DIVISION, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, DC; CORNELIUS FOLEY, PRESIDENT, STATE OF NEW YORK HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES CORPORATION, ALBANY, NEW YORK; KRISTINE MACDERMOTT, ASSISTANT PROVOST, ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT, UNIVERSITY OF AKRON, AKRON, OHIO; ARNOLDO RODRIGUEZ, PRINCIPAL, MCALLEN, TEXAS; AND JOHN JENSON, PRESIDENT, HEP/CAMP ASSOCIATION, BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY, BOISE, IDAHO

Mr. SARACINO. My testimony today comes from another experience, as well. I was one of the many students who financed his education through the National Defense Student Loan Program, as well as through on-campus jobs and summer employment. Our eldest daughter, in fact, is now finishing her freshman year in the same way—loans and work.

For my family, there has never been a question about postsecondary education and its benefits. But we have had the support and the advantages that are not easily available to many of our youth today. We all know that, more often than not, today that is not the case for so many of our youth.

It is with a sense of conviction that I speak about the need to intervene early in the lives of many students and their parents if they are to make the most of the many postsecondary education experiences available to them.

That intervention has two phases. First, counselors should work closely and carefully with students and their parents or guardians to ensure that the courses chosen and the attention given to completing them is commensurate with future acceptance into postsecondary education.

Second, counselors must be able to impart specific information regarding financial aid possibilities that are available for well-prepared and qualified students.

My association, the National Association of College Admission Counselors, places the highest priority on legislation such as the Student Counseling and Assistance Network Act, H.R. 1524, that was recently introduced by Representative Thomas Sawyer. We

also look forward to studying closely the approach to early intervention taken by Representative Nita Lowey and others.

NACAC is an association of more than 5,000 counselors whose primary area of expertise is guiding students through the difficult and sometimes confusing transition from high school to postsecondary education. Our members work at both the secondary and college levels, and can be found in both public and private institutions.

You might wonder why we are so interested in early intervention counseling activities. Well, one only needs to look at the demographic figures for my own home state, California. In less than 10 years, people of color will make up the majority of our students enrolled in our schools.

One of the most respected education institutions in the Nation is in my home state, the University of California. Well, as mandated by the state, the UC system is charged with educating the top 12.5 percent of our state's graduating seniors. Recent figures reveal that only 4.5 percent of our African American students and 5 percent of our Hispanic American students graduating this year are eligible for the UC system.

To put it another way, out of 100 African American students now starting in 10th grade, only 4 will be academically eligible for the UC system. For Hispanic Americans, that figure is not much better at 7 out of 100. We have to reach these students earlier and more effectively.

Why is this happening? Often, postsecondary education is not seen as a viable option for this segment of our population for many reasons, among them are a lack of knowledge about a qualifying course of study, how to secure tutorial and mentoring help, information about realistic financial aid possibilities, and how to actually apply for both admission and financial aid.

If we are to have a pool of qualified and motivated students entering our institutions, we must begin to work with students and parents when dreams and aspirations for the future are still flexible and open.

There are three truisms about today's students: number one, students need strong precollege guidance and counseling and admission counseling programs to assist in the various transitions; number two, students need better and more accessible information about preparing for and choosing postsecondary education; number three, far too many students, especially people of color and the economically disadvantaged, remain underserved in American education. This lack of information, coupled with deficiencies in our educational experience, translates into the underrepresentation of these students in our postsecondary institutions.

The members of NACAC believe that the Federal financial aid system can provide incentives to find a way out to the poverty/welfare cycle for young Americans who are at risk because of family circumstances beyond their control. We also think that the working families of modest means can hope for a productive way of life for their children because of the body of education programs that now exist.

Because of these convictions, we developed a program with a grant from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation that we call

Parents and Counselors Together or PACT. This is directed, specifically, at elementary and middle school populations and provides information to parents and training for those who work the families and youth—from the counselors and principals to the playground supervisors and case workers—about the possibilities of postsecondary education for their students.

We are now evaluating the program's success after 2 years of operation and are extremely encouraged by what we see. But no matter how successful this and similar programs are, they can only reach a small fraction of those who need our support. That is why we call for the Federal intervention program.

The Federal program should include a component that collects information about existing programs and makes the details available to communities that want to install or upgrade programs of their own, as spelled out in Mr. Sawyer's bill.

It should also contain provisions to alert families to the price tags associated with educational options, including the specifics of loans, grants, and scholarship programs that they might be qualified for.

Finally, it should contain a counselor training component, and counselors must receive better training, information, and resources to enable them to better serve the public.

Many schools, today, do not place an emphasis on or provide an adequate precollege guidance program. We know that most counselors want to make this a part of their daily routine, but they lack the time, resources, and formal training.

And while such services are important for all students in all schools, regardless of economic status, it is axiomatic that the schools that provide the most limited services and have the fewest resources are the ones that need them the most. And so, the cycle perpetuates itself: the underserved become the most underrepresented in higher education, and something must be done to break this cycle.

This is documented in the GAO July 1990 report entitled, "Gaps in Parents' and Students' Knowledge of School Costs and Financial Aid" that I assume Ms. Chelimsky could address.

Yesterday, you heard testimony about the need for simplification of the process and of the forms used. That is very important. We are convinced, however, that training, tools and resources are also critical to complete the package. H.R. 1524 rightly calls for counselor training. In so doing, it restores a service that was once a part of the Department of Education.

Some of you may recall that in the 1970s, special training was made available to counselors as well as to financial aid administrators and business officers. This is no longer the case, and parents and students are the poorer because of it. I'm sure you are also aware of the demise of the much used Student Guide that helped in financial aid.

Rather than eliminating guidance resources, NACAC believes that the Federal Government should develop better quality, more complete resources, and distribute them to a wider audience. This should include videotapes, audiotapes, and software information programs.

Technology does exist today to establish a comprehensive data base including financial aid sources, explanations of various programs, who is eligible, how to apply, and the academic admissions programs. This might be available to schools, libraries, youth centers, and elsewhere.

According to OMB WATCH, 97 percent of our students today have a computer on site. This would be of great help to the counselors as they work with families. Such a system might also provide some kind of early assessment of future financial assistance.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the members of my association are committed to providing counseling services to students moving though the school to college transition. We ask that you consider helping us to properly guide American families by including an early intervention component in the Higher Education Act of 1965. We believe that this is a valid and necessary activity for the United States government, that will pay great dividends for each dollar spent.

By intervening early in the school careers of children, we can prepare the work force and professionals needed for the future. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Daniel Saracino follows:]

TESTIMONY OF

DANIEL J. SARACINO

PRESIDENT-ELECT

National Association of College Admission Counselors

1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 430
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 836-2222 FAX (703) 836-8015

Before the Education and Labor Committee
Postsecondary Education Subcommittee

United States House of Representatives

May 15, 1991

DANIEL J. SARACINO
Dean of Undergraduate Admissions, Santa Clara University, California

Mr. Saracino holds a bachelors degree in government and a masters degree in educational administration from the University of Notre Dame, and was employed there as an admissions officer until 1977 when he left to become Director of Admissions at Santa Clara University. Since 1984, he has served as Dean of Undergraduate Admissions at Santa Clara.

He has been chair of the board of directors of the Articulation Council of California; chair of the admissions council of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities; chair of the western region executive committee of The College Board; and is a member of the advisory committee of the California Student Opportunity and Access Program. This program has a $2 million dollar budget and reaches 30,000 underrepresented youth in California. He held a number of leadership posts with the Western Association of College Admission Counselors before he was selected, in 1990, as president-elect of the National Association of College Admission Counselors.

Mr. Saracino is married with three children, each of whom are at different levels of schooling--college, high school and elementary school.

Mr. Chairman, I am Dan Saracino, President-elect of the National Association of College Admission Counselors and Dean of Undergraduate Admission of Santa Clara University. My testimony today comes from another experience, as well: I was one of the many students who financed his education through the National Defense Student Loan Program in addition to summer and on-campus jobs. Our eldest daughter is now finishing her freshman year of college in the same way: loans and work. For my family, there has never been a question about postsecondary education and its benefits. But, we have had the advantage of support, encouragement, and clear information about how to prepare for and finance these opportunities. We all know that, more often than not, today that is not the case for many of our young students.

It is with both a sense of honor and conviction that I speak about the need to intervene early in the lives of students and their parents if they are to make the most of the many postsecondary education experiences that are available to qualified students.

That intervention has two phases:

First, counselors should work closely and carefully with students and their parents or guardians to ensure that the courses chosen and the attention given to completing them is commensurate with future acceptance into postsecondary education.

Second, counselors must be able to impart specific information regarding financial aid possibilities that are available for well prepared and qualified students.

My association places the highest priority on legislation such as the Student Counseling and Assistance Network or SCAN--H.R. 1524--that was recently introduced by Representative Thomas Sawyer. We are also intrigued with other approaches to early intervention such as the legislation sponsored by Representative Harold Ford and the so called "I Have a Dream" approach of working with students, and we look forward to studying closely the approach to early intervention taken by Representative Nita Lowey and others.

I might also add that the American Council on Education, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the College Board, the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, and the National School Boards Association, to name a few of our colleagues, all see the need for early intervention activities along the lines that we will discuss today.

By way of background, we are an association of more than 5,000 counselors working in American education whose primary area of expertise is guiding students through the difficult and sometimes confusing transition from high school to postsecondary education. Our members work at both the secondary school and college levels and can be found in public, private, and parochial institutions.

Given this sketch of our membership, you might wonder why we are so interested in early intervention counseling activities for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students. One only needs to look at the demographic figures for my state of California. In less than 10 years, people of color will be a majority of students enrolled in our schools.

One of the most respected educational institutions in the nation is in my home state--the University of California. As mandated by "The 1990 Master Plan for Higher Education in California," the University of California system is charged with educating the top 12 1/2 percent of the state's graduating seniors. Recent statewide figures reveal that only 4 1/2 percent of our African American high school seniors and 5 percent of our Hispanic American high school seniors who are graduating now are eligible for admission to UCal.

Since the Hispanic population is multiplying at a most significant rate, and if only 5 percent will continue to be eligible, the total number of non-eligible students will be astronomical.

To put it another way, out of 100 African American students now starting in 10th grade in California, only 4 will be academically eligible for admission to the UC system. For Hispanic Americans, the figure is not much better, it is 7 percent. We have to reach these students earlier and more effectively.

Why is this happening? Often, postsecondary education is not seen as a viable option for this segment of our population for many reasons; among them are a lack of knowledge about a qualifying course of study, how to secure tutorial or mentoring help, information about realistic financial aid possibilities, and how to actually apply for admission and aid.

If we are to have a pool of qualified and motivated students entering our postsecondary institutions: trade, technical, and vocational schools, and private and public colleges and universities, we must begin to work

with students and parents when dreams and aspirations for the future are still flexible and open.

There are three truisms about today's students that I will cover in my testimony:

1. Students need strong precollege guidance and counseling and college admission counseling programs to assist in the various transitions that they will face in their schooling experiences.

2. Students need better and more accessible information about preparing for, choosing, and enrolling in postsecondary education.

3. Far too many students, especially people of color and the economically disadvantaged, remain underserved in American education. The lack of service and information, coupled with other deficiencies in the educational experience, translates into the underrepresentation of these students at our colleges and universities.

Underlying these three obvious truths are the frustrations suffered by students, parents, and counselors alike as they try to formulate well-informed, quality decisions about postsecondary education.

Need for Early Intervention Programs

The members of NACAC believe that the federal financial aid system can provide incentives to find a way out of the poverty/welfare cycle for young Americans who are at-risk because of family circumstances beyond their control. We also think that working families of modest means can hope for a productive way of life for their children, because of the body of education programs that now exist.

Because of these convictions, we developed a program, with a grant from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, that we call Parents and Counselors Together or PACT. This is directed specifically at elementary and middle school populations and provides information to parents, and training for those who work with families and youth--from counselors and principals to playground supervisors and case workers--about the possibilities of postsecondary education. We are now evaluating the programs' success after two years of operation and we are very encouraged by what we hear.

No matter how successful this and similar programs are, however, they can reach only a small fraction of those who need such support. That is why we call for a federal early intervention program.

The federal program should include a component that collects information about existing programs and make the details available to communities that want to install or upgrade programs of their own.

It should also contain provisions to alert families to the "price tags" associated with each educational option, including the specifics of grant, loan, and scholarship programs that exist for qualified students.

Finally, it should contain a counselor training component. Counselors must receive better training, information, and resources to enable them to better serve the public.

Strengthening Counseling in the Schools

After guidance in course selection and college entrance requirements, students need specific information about financial aid programs, how they work, who is eligible, how to apply, and the timelines for notification.

Many schools today do not place an emphasis on or provide an adequate precollege guidance and counseling program. We know that most counselors want to make this a part of their daily routine, but they lack time, resources, and formal training. And, while such services are important for all students in all schools, regardless of economic status, it is axiomatic that the schools that provide the most limited services and have the fewest resources are the ones that need them the most. And so, the cycle perpetuates itself: the underserved become the most underrepresented in higher education. Something must be done to break this cycle.

This is documented in the General Accounting Office July 1990 report: "Gaps in Parents' and Students' Knowledge of School Costs and Federal Aid." It states that "In assessing basic knowledge levels, we found that students and parents knew surprisingly little about financial aid for higher education or the costs of postsecondary schools. A major national study in 1980 found that only 12 percent of high school sophomores were aware of the Pell Grant program and only 8 percent were aware of Stafford Loans....Parents lacked information about financial aid throughout their children's junior high and high school years....Further, we found that there was a relation between a family's income and its level of awareness of federal financial aid."

Yesterday, you heard testimony about the need for simplification of the process and of the forms used. That is very important. We are convinced, however, that training, tools, and resources are necessary to complete the package. H.R. 1524 rightly calls for counselor training. In so doing, it restores a service that was once a part of the Department

of Education. Some of you may recall that in the 1970s, special training was made available to counselors as well as to financial aid administrators and business officers. This is no longer the case, and parents and students are the poorer for it.

Improved and Accessible Information

Along with this cut back in training, resources are also harder to find. For example: until last year the Department published a comprehensive and much-used handbook about federal student aid, titled The Student Guide: Financial Aid from the U.S. Department of Education. This excellent publication was reduced from 82 pages to under 20 pages last year because of budget reductions.

Rather than eliminating guidance resources, NACAC believes that the federal government should develop better quality, more complete resources, and disseminate them to a wider audience. This should include videotapes, audiotapes, and software information programs.

Technology exists today to establish a comprehensive computer data base system, containing financial aid sources, explanations of the various programs, who is eligible, how to apply, and admission programs. This might be made available to schools, libraries, youth centers, and elsewhere. (According to OMB WATCH, 97 percent of our schools today have a computer on site.) This would be a great help to counselors as they work with families. Such a system might also provide some kind of early assessment of future financial assistance.

It would also go far to eliminate an undesirable side-effect of the lack of information. Over the past few years an industry has grown that

collects and sells information about financial aid. Usually, it is a compilation of publicly available data that is free for the asking. What is sold often is out-of-date and is usually incomplete. Yet, the businesses are thriving because parents are desperate for this kind of centralized information and they are willing to spend scarce dollars to get it. The situation is ripe for fraud and abuse.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the members of the National Association of College Admission Counselors are committed to providing counseling services to students moving through the school to college transition. We ask that you consider helping us to properly guide American families by including an early intervention component in the Higher Education Act of 1965. We believe that this is a valid and necessary activity for the United States government that will pay great dividends for each dollar spent.

By intervening early in the school careers of children, working with them and their parents regarding the benefits of a postsecondary education, instilling in all parties a sense of the time and energy needed to achieve worthwhile goals, and providing the proper training for counselors and others to whom youth look for guidance and help, we can prepare the workforce and professionals needed for the future.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you very much for your thoughtful testimony.

Ms. Paula Martin of the East Harlem College and Career Counseling Program, welcome.

Ms. MARTIN. Thank you. Good morning members of the subcommittee and Chairman Sawyer. I sit before you this morning to address the need for early intervention in education for our nation's youth. I also come before you today with over 17 years of experience working in educational opportunity programs, most notably, TRIO. In that time I have served in both the Upward Bound and the Talent Search programs, holding staff positions ranging from teacher to director.

Currently, I am the executive director of a program called the East Harlem College and Career Counseling Program, which is a nonprofit community-based program in East Harlem, New York. That program has had 14 years of experience with the Talent Search program. And in 1989, we were fortunate enough to be one of 58 programs in the country who received a middle schools initiative. That was one of the first Federal initiatives to link, I believe, elementary and junior high school with postsecondary education.

In addition, I am testifying on behalf of the National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations and, most importantly, for the young people of our nation, who will need early intervention programs in order to have meaningful survival.

I would like to begin by telling you a little bit about how our program works. Our middle schools component began with 50 students in 7th and 8th grade in October of 1989. And to give you an idea of what a typical week might be for a student in our program, each student takes 45 minutes of Math and English instruction once a week, each student also receives 1 hour of tutoring in Math and English, we also have available for students a homework lab.

Each student also receives individual and group counseling in such areas as motivation, personal needs, and academics. As part of that counseling, we also have students signing contracts in which they have reached agreement with the counselor and themselves as to their short- and long-term goals.

Each student takes a career interest inventory, again, to begin to address what their interest and their needs might be as far as career aspirations. Each student takes 4 weeks of a workshop in study skills and test-taking techniques. We also have selected students who receive SSAT or Secondary School Admissions Test preparation classes. We provide college trips for our students, and we also have a parent involvement component which is absolutely essential.

Our program is run in the school, after school, 4 days out of the week. Each student spends a minimum of 3½ hours a week with our program. Our staff include teachers from within the school as well as outside of the school, tutors who consist of college and graduate students, a counselor, and a part-time assistant.

A typical student in our program is 12 or 13 years old, a minority youngster from a one-parent household with at least three siblings, eligible and part of the school free lunch program. At least one member of the family is involved with drugs either as a dealer or a user. The student knows a youngster or a member of their

family who has died violently. Their parents have no more than a high school diploma. Their average household income is $9,500. And these youngsters live 1 day at time, for fear that tomorrow is not promised.

They are streetwise and they obey street rules. This further sharpens their skills in being able to differentiate between those who are committed to and sensitive to their needs and those who are in it for the recognition and the money. Thus, it is imperative that staff in these programs be committed, sensitive to their needs, culturally competent and aware, and also are diverse in their backgrounds and ethnicity.

This enables a rapport or emotional ties to be set up between the two that allows for rules to be set up, structure imposed, and discipline mandated—I grant you, not without some resistance and grumbling on the parts of the students, but ultimately, they follow it. But what we cannot forget is that for all their streetwiseness, underneath this exterior, there lies a frightened child. We serve as a countervailing force that comes at a critical juncture in their young lives.

After we had run our program for several months in 1989, we realized that there were some additional needs that we needed to incorporate in the program in order to enhance its effectiveness and its efforts. And so we began by providing light snacks for the students, by sponsoring invitation-only parties, by having an award ceremony to recognize the students' achievements, both in attendance, academics, attitude, as well as their overall improvement. We also sponsored things like academically and culturally-based competitions.

As further testimony to our belief and that of others that early intervention is the way to go, we set out and received a sizable 2 year grant from the Aaron Diamond Foundation to expand our program to where we now serve 91 students—50 students of whom are funded under the Federal money, the remainder from this private foundation—and also to provide some of the enhancements mentioned above that are not allowed under the Federal grant.

Early intervention is not only the wave of the future, but also a necessity. If we are to begin to recapture the youth of this nation before they become a statistical blight on their communities and the Nation, for certain, just as we undergo a transition from high school to college, so there is a transition from elementary to junior high and from junior high to high school.

If the students are not adequately prepared academically to make the transition, there is no way they can succeed with all the emotional and social adjustments that must be made as well. Early intervention is an enterprise with many complexities. There are several layers that must be addressed simultaneously in order for it to be successful. These layers are comprised of emotional, social, intellectual, and medical needs.

Let me briefly describe the difference that early intervention can make. We have a young lady named Glenda Oquendo who joined our middle school program at its beginning in 1989. She was in the 7th grade. She was on probation for having struck a teacher in her elementary school, and so she was required to see the probation officer at least once a week. Glenda lived in a single parent house-

hold. She had a 23-year-old boyfriend who was known to be a drug dealer, and often spent time with him, with her mother's knowledge.

Despite all of this, Glenda had legitimate aspirations, interestingly enough, one of them being law. However, she had a problem with her attendance. She came to our program fairly often, but her attendance in school was sporadic at best. However, once her probation ended, Glenda's attendance at school became even more sporadic.

After a few months, however, she did return to our program, managed to pass three out of four of her classes by the end of the spring term, and has returned to the program this fall and is continuing to show improvement in both her grades and her attitude toward school.

Contrastingly, a student that comes in through our high school Talent Search program comes to us generally as a senior, has aspirations but has not the courses or the grades with which to support an easy transition from high school to college. And so they are faced with few choices and, perhaps, remedial courses in order to begin their college and postsecondary life.

In order to give you some sense of what our intervention program has meant to our students, here's one quote I would like to give you, "Going to this university was nice. I learned that you have a lot of work and studying to do. I know I haven't decided on what career to go into but, I do want to be somebody in the future. So, I know that college is going to be important in what I want to be."

Designing and staffing effective middle school and junior high school intervention programs is manageable. In 1991, over 200 Talent Search projects will implement such programs in the 1991-1992 academic year. While the types of models implemented in the Talent Search may vary in intensity, all will involve at least academic counseling, exposure to college campuses and the range of options that postsecondary education provides, parental involvement components, and personal and motivational counseling.

In addition to TRIO programs, other initiatives funded with state and private funds provide these types of intervention, oftentimes coupling personal intervention with a promise of future grant aid. The program which has received the most attention is "I Have A Dream," initiated by Eugene Lang, of which I am aware, and I have served some of the youngsters through our Talent Search program by providing support services such as tutoring and college visits that are not available to all I Have A Dream students through their sponsors.

We are, in essence, supplementing the shortfalls of this program. This is due to the fact that although the sponsors recognize the need, they do not always provide the money or the resources for support services in addition to the grant guarantees.

Although the promise of a grant has made some difference, more of a difference might happen if it was linked with early intervention programs, such as Talent Search. Tony Lopez, who is the National Director of Support Services for the I Have A Dream program is one of my former Upward Bound students.

In our view, the most difficult challenge facing this subcommittee as it attempts to expand the number of early intervention initiatives is identifying and nurturing the infrastructure to conduct such programs in light of the level of need. In East Harlem, whose boundaries are from 96th to 125th Street from 5th Avenue to FDR Drive, we are serving 91 students, but there are 3,661 middle and junior high school students who have the need for the type of program that we're running.

It is clear that neither the urban or suburban schools have been or will be able to intervene effectively to enable low income and first generation students to prepare for postsecondary programs in the near future. Parallel programs, such as Talent Search, working closely with the schools, but having postsecondary preparation as their principal focus, must continue to be funded by Federal and other sources.

At the same time, other means of reaching middle and junior high school students must be utilized. The media campaigns authorized in the Sawyer bill are one key element. They are needed; they are important. Such campaigns worked for the Armed Forces, for the Say No to Drugs. This, I submit, is equally important as a way out for our young people.

The Sawyer bill also includes a second component which the National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations strongly endorses: training programs for youth and community workers in order to enable them to inform the young people with whom they interact regarding the availability of student financial aid. These aspects of the Sawyer bill would complement our efforts and make the task easier, but most importantly, it would reach a population, poor, historically left out of the mainstream pipeline of receiving information.

In closing, I would like to summarize our recommendations. One, modification of the Talent Search authorization to allow provision of service to 6th grade students; substantial expansion of the Talent Search network.

Two, increase the capacity of Talent Search programs to work with neighborhood groups and voluntary associations to utilize their influence to encourage first generation young people to attend college. And by that I mean increasing the base grant of the Talent Search program to a minimum of $300,000 per year, over a 5 year grant period, fully understanding that there are limited resources but it would still not adequately address the need.

Three, a media campaign similar to that included in the Sawyer bill.

Four, training programs also included in the Sawyer bill, as I previously mentioned.

And five, the National Council is also recommending that the subcommittee give serious consideration to establishing a grant program tied to Pell eligibility for which students might qualify through participation in Talent Search, early intervention programs, or other state or private early intervention programs.

Finally, I would like to leave you with this: a recent book highlighted in an April 23rd New York Times article, "There Are No Children Here" by Alex Kotlowitz, describes the experiences of two young boys growing up in the housing projects in Chicago. One of

the few positive impacts on their lives was an early intervention program associated with the Upward Bound program at that University of Illinois in Chicago, the Summer Scholars program.

The book chronicles how the youngest child, Pharaoh, is introduced to the program and how he came back to the projects with tales of the campus that delighted his mother. "He talked of the footbridges and the big glass buildings and of the students who seemed to be everywhere always carrying books. Pharaoh would tell his mother that he planned to attend college there." When the Upward Bound staff asked the assembled students what they wanted to be when they grew up, Pharaoh knew. He wanted to be a Congressman so that he could change the rules.

Mr. Sawyer, members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today. And I hope this testimony provides you with some information that will help you change the rules so that young people such as Pharaoh and those I work with in East Harlem will have a more realistic opportunity to attend and graduate from college.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Paula Martin follows:]

National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations

1025 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Suite 310 Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 347-7430
FAX (202) 347-0786
Information Line (202) 347-1724
Job Line (202) 347-1821

Association for Equality and Excellence in Education, Inc.
Association of Special Programs in Region Eight
Caribbean Association of TRIO Programs
Mid America Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel
Midwestern Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel
New England Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel
Northwest Association of Special Programs
Southeastern Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel
Southwest Association of Student Assistance Programs
Western Association of Educational Opportunity Personnel

TESTIMONY OF PAULA MARTIN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE EAST HARLEM COLLEGE AND CAREER COUNSELING PROGRAM
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REGARDING EARLY INTERVENTION TO PROMOTE POSTSECONDARY ACCESS AND RETENTION

May 15, 1991

Congressman Ford, members of the Subcommittee, I sit before you this morning to address the need for Early Intervention in education for our nation's youth. I, myself, have over 17 years experience with educational opportunity programs, most notably TRIO programs. During that time I have worked in Upward Bound and Talent Search programs, holding staff positions ranging from teacher to director. My name is Paula Martin and currently I am the Executive Director of a not-for-profit organization, The East Harlem College and Career Counseling Program, Inc., based in New York City. Our organization has had a Talent Search program for the past fourteen years of our twenty-one year history. In 1989, we were one of 58 Talent Search programs funded by the United States Department of Education to initiate a middle schools component as part of our Talent Search program. I am testifying today on behalf of the National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations (NCEOA).

The East Harlem Middle School Program

Our middle school program began with 50 seventh and eighth grade students at one East Harlem school in October 1989. We chose to concentrate on one school so as to maximize our efforts and effect on the school and students. We mapped out a comprehensive program to service these youngsters to include personal, academic and motivational counseling; basic skills instruction; tutoring; college visits; study skills and test taking techniques; high school selection advisement; secondary school aptitude test (SSAT) preparation classes; and information

regarding postsecondary education and financial assistance. We also felt there was need for parent involvement and as such made overtures to incorporate parents in student trips, provide regular reports on students' progress in the program and consult on any potential problem areas. All our services to the students are provided in the school at the end of the school day, four times a week.

If one could typify the student in our middle schools programs, the description would be as follows:

> Age of 12 or 13, minority youngster from a one parent household with at least 3 siblings. Eligible for the school free lunch program; at least one member of the family is involved with drugs either as a user or dealer; knows a youngster or a member of the family that has died violently; parent(s) have no more than a high school diploma; average household income is $9,500, and they live one day at a time for fear that tomorrow is not promised.

PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT

After several months of running the program, we quickly found that there were several additional things needed in order to enhance the effectiveness of the program and the responsiveness of the students. We began providing light snacks, having determined that students were quite hungry by the time our after school activities commenced; held by invitation only parties twice during the year as incentives for good work and atten-

dance; held an Awards Ceremony in which select students were given certificates for perfect attendance, academic achievement, attitude, and overall improvement; sponsored special trips as reward for academic achievement and improvement; and academic and culturally-based competitions for rewards. In order to carry out these incentive activities, we had to seek out additional funding from private sources since they were not allowable under the Department of Education grant.

THE NEED FOR EARLY INTERVENTION

Over the two years that we have run the middle school program, I have become increasingly convinced that early intervention is not only the wave of the future, but also a necessity, if we are to begin to recapture the youth of this nation before they become a statistical blight on their communities and the nation. For certain, just as we undergo a transition from high school to college, so is there a transition from elementary to junior high and junior high to high school. If the students are not adequately prepared academically to make their transitions, there is no way they can succeed with all the emotional and social adjustments that must be made as well.

Having worked exclusively with high school students for most of my professional life in Talent Search and Upward Bound, I have found it continually disheartening to have young adults come for college counseling to find that they are missing the necessary

courses or concentration in a subject area or grades to matriculate at a college without undertaking remedial courses or for the career goal they have in mind. Much of this is due to a lack of knowledge, guidance, curriculum advisement and understanding of what is required for college and careers. It is a condition, however, that didn't just begin at high school, but one that becomes increasingly compounded by the years stemming back to elementary school. As was stated by Mr. L. Scott Miller, senior vice president of the Council for Aid to Education, in an interview featured in the April issue of AAHE, "...the gaps we are seeing at age 17 are well established by the middle of the elementary years. National Assessment of Educational Progress scores at age 9 are wonderful predictors of NAEP scores at age 17."

Let me briefly describe the difference early intervention can make:

Glenda Oquendo joined our Middle School program at its beginning in 1989. She was in the 7th grade, on probation for having struck a teacher in her elementary school, and so she was required to see the probation officer once a week. Glenda lived in a single parent household, had a 23-year old boyfriend, who was also known to be a drug dealer, and often spent time with him with her mother's knowledge. Despite all this, Glenda had certain legitimate ambitions, interestingly one of them being law. Glenda initially began participating in our program, partly as a requirement of her probation, and it became clear that she was bright and quick. However, although her attendance in our program was fairly good, her attendance at school was sporadic overall. The result was failing grades first and second marking period. Once her probation ended midway through the second term, however, Glenda's attendance initially was even more sporadic, because it was no longer a condition for her probation. But then Glenda started coming back to participate in the MSI program. The end result at the end of the school year was a Glenda who

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

passed three of her four classes. In the fall of 1990, Glenda returned to our program and her progress in academics and attitude have continued to show improvement.

In contrast, Isabel Santiago entered our high school Talent Search program in the beginning of her 12th grade year. She was seeking college counseling, financial aid counseling and tutoring assistance. Her grade point average was in the mid-seventies, and upon taking the SAT exam, her combined score was below 700. She had a desire to major in business, yet her high school transcript did not represent a strong math background. Her family background was a female-headed household, low income, no one previously having attended college. Isabel had the desire and the willingness to learn, but because of a lack of guidance, curriculum advisement, and just plain information, is facing remedial courses once she is placed in college and limited in her postsecondary choices to either a two-year community college or a less competitive institution.

Early intervention would have provided Isabel with the information, tools and knowledge that could have possibly saved her the anguish of making up for courses she should have taken in high school or even sooner; career information that would have allowed her to make decisions regarding the needed coursework; and, finally, the grades and confidence that would have allowed her a wider variety of college choices.

In order to give you some sense of what our early intervention program has meant to our students, here are some quotes from students:

> "This trip was very good for young people like myself. It gives you confidence and makes you feel good about your future. To attend college, you have to work hard. I enjoyed visiting the classes and seeing what college life is all about";
>
> "Going to this university was nice. I learned that you have a lot of work and studying to do. I know I haven't decided on what career to go into but, I do want to be somebody in the future. So, I know that college is going to be important in what I want to be";
>
> "My class visited Manhattan College. It was a great experience because I learned many wonderful things. There were many labs in the school. Engineering, chemical and electronic labs were visited..."

DEFINING POSSIBLE INTERVENTION: ELEMENTS OF THE SOLUTION

Designing and staffing effective middle school and junior high school intervention programs is a manageable task. Under the Fiscal 1991 TRIO appropriations, over 200 Talent Search projects will implement such programs in the 1991-92 academic

year. While the type of models implemented in the Talent Search models vary in intensity, all involve:

1) academic counseling which preserves student options;

2) exposure to college campuses and the range of options that postsecondary education provides;

3) parental involvement;

4) close liaison with the schools; and

5) personal counseling and the demonstration of concern and confidence in the student's future and potential.

In addition to TRIO programs, other initiatives funded with state and private funds provide these types of intervention, often times coupling personal intervention with the promise of future grant aid. The program which has received the most attention is "I Have a Dream" initiated by Eugene Lang.

ELEMENTS OF AN EARLY INTERVENTION DELIVERY SYSTEM

In our view, the most difficult challenge facing this Subcommittee as it attempts to expand the number of early intervention initiatives is identifying and nurturing the infrastructure to conduct such programs in light of the level of need. In East Harlem, for example, there are 3,661 middle and junior high school students who have need of the type of program I describe but whom we cannot presently serve.

One naturally turns to the public school system to conduct interventions on the scale, but in the experience of the TRIO

community, absent very substantial funding from the federal government, it is unlikely that our urban schools could or would effectively intervene to enable low-income and first-generation students to prepare for postsecondary programs.

Counseling staffs of even suburban schools, as the chairman has noted on many occasions, have little time for college counseling. Those in urban districts are often paralyzed by resource shortfalls and disciplinary issues. The current financial crisis affecting states and localities promises only that the situation in the near term will worsen. Parallel programs such as Talent Search -- working closely with the schools but having postsecondary preparation as their principal focus -- must continue to be funded by federal and other sources.

At the same time, other means of reaching middle and junior high school students must be utilized. The media campaigns authorized in the Sawyer bill are one key element. The Sawyer bill also includes a second component which the NCEOA strongly endorses: training programs for youth and community workers to enable them to inform the young people with whom they interact regarding the availability of student financial aid. Grant aid tied to Pell and attached to early intervention programs should be explained.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1) modification of the Talent Search authorization to allow provision of service to sixth grade students; substantial expansion of the Talent Search network;

2) increase in the capacity of Talent Search programs to work with neighborhood groups and voluntary associations to utilize their influence to encourage first-generation young people to attend college;

3) a media campaign similar to that included in the Sawyer bill to increase public awareness of the availability of financial aid; and

4) training programs, also included in the Sawyer bill, to inform community and youth workers, school personnel and others working with youth regarding the availability of student assistance.

The NCEOA is also recommending that the Subcommittee give serious consideration to establishing a grant program -- tied to Pell eligibility -- for which students might qualify through participation in Talent Search early intervention programs or other state or private early intervention programs.

Such a grant program might encourage the establishment of many early intervention programs by states, colleges, community agencies, businesses and other entities while assuring that the federal investment is used to increase grant aid. Early intervention programs would necessarily be certified by state education agencies or other appropriate groups.

A recent book, highlighted in an April 23rd New York Times article, There Are No Children Here by Alex Kotlowitz, describes the experiences of two young boys growing up in the housing

projects in Chicago. One of the few positive impacts on their lives was an early intervention program associated with the Upward Bound program at the University of Illinois in Chicago, the Summer Scholars program.

The book chronicles how the youngest child, Pharaoh, is introduced to the program and how he came back to the projects with tales of the campus that delighted his mother. "He talked of the footbridges and the big glass buildings and of the students who seemed to be everywhere always carrying books. Pharaoh would tell (his mother) that he planned to attend college there". When the Upward Bound staff asked the assembled children what they wanted to be when they grew up, Pharaoh knew. He wanted to be a congressman so that he could "change the rules".

Mr. Ford, Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today. I hope that this testimony provides you some information that will help you "change the rules" so that young people such as Pharaoh and those I work with in East Harlem will have a more realistic opportunity to attend and graduate from college.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you very much. I think that the experience of that young man, Pharaoh, is not unfamiliar to many of us on this panel. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Our next witness is Eleanor Chelimsky, the Assistant Comptroller General for Programs Evaluation and Methodology at the GAO. Welcome.

Ms. CHELIMSKY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. It's a pleasure to be here today to talk about GAO's studies of efforts to improve the proportion of American high school graduates who go on to college. That proportion, as you know, currently stands at only 40 percent, only 26 percent for young black men, including enrollments in both two and 4 year colleges.

Let me begin by introducing the people who are here with me today, Fritz Mulhauser and Kathleen White, both of whom have been deeply involved in both of our studies.

In doing our studies, we had two major aims: first, to assess what was being done, on a small scale, in the private sector to improve students chances of getting a college education; and second, to determine to what degree students and their parents are aware of Federal aid for which they are eligible.

Private tuition guarantee programs were the subject of our first study, and by the way, they included the I Have A Dream series of projects. I have four findings to report from that. First, in 1988–1989, we found out that about 42,000 students across America were involved in tuition guarantee programs, and about 2,900 additional students were getting postsecondary tuition benefits amounting to $1.6 million.

Second, we found four different types of private sector programs known as sponsorship programs, "pay for grades," "last-dollar," and university-based programs. Of these we especially noted the promise of the sponsorship programs which appear to be having two important early results: first, keeping students in school; and second, markedly increasing their motivation and achievement. Both of these interim outcomes are, of course, prerequisites for the long-term effects we would all like to see later on, better access to and participation in postsecondary education.

Third finding: we were structuring our site visits and interviews by the high implementation quality of some of the sponsorship program components, especially early intervention, personal mentoring, and intensive academic help.

But we were also concerned—this was our fourth finding—about the lack of systematic evaluation being done on these programs. Given the promise of some of them and the consequent likelihood of emulation, what this means is that the same trial and error, reinventing the wheel process, will have to be experienced by every new initiative of this type that starts up. Even more importantly, it means that information on the real effectiveness of these programs will continue to be lacking for public policy decisions like the ones this committee now confronts.

Turning to our work synthesizing studies of student and parent awareness of Federal aid programs, here we found a really dismal picture. For example, only 12 percent of high school sophomores were aware of the Pell grant program and only 8 percent knew of

Stafford loans. Although high school seniors were more likely to at least recognize these programs, they had little other knowledge including whether or not they might be eligible for them.

In general, parents, whether of junior high or high school students, had little if any information about financial aid. Fewer than half the parents of seniors could even identify the major Federal aid programs. On the other hand, both parents and students tended to possess a great deal of erroneous information, grossly underestimating or overestimating the actual costs of higher education.

Mr. Chairman, to my mind, these findings raise the question of how long it should take to bring the good news from Ghent to Aix. I know the transfer of information can take a long time. Porcelain, for example, was developed in China during the Chou dynasty around 300 B.C., and then finally achieved widespread use during the Han period around 200 A.D, that's a lag of 500 years.

But after all, we're in the 1990's now, and Pell grants have been around for nearly 20 years. We can even get from Ghent to Aix a little faster than we used to on horseback. There has to be some way to increase the numbers of students and parents who have accurate information about Federal aid.

What lessons have we learned from our studies? Three I would say. First, it makes absolutely no sense to support Federal aid programs that are so very poorly known to their likely beneficiaries. On the other hand, we shouldn't overestimate the importance of information alone in view of the motivational and skill barriers that must be overcome if students are to succeed in school and move on to higher education.

Second, and in the same way, reducing cost barriers to higher education is not all that needs to be done for disadvantaged students. Indeed, the big lesson from the sponsorship programs is the critical need for things other than money, such as extraordinary personal and academic support, not only extra weeks and months of supplementary schooling, but nights, weekends, and summers of close guidance and mentoring that we saw.

Third, I believe we must determine the effectiveness of these programs. If Head Start is celebrated today, it's largely because sound evaluations of that program contributed to well-informed decisions to maintain and expand it. Without systematic evaluation of sponsorship programs, I fear that some very promising advances in overcoming barriers to student achievement and access to higher education will be lost to public policy.

That concludes my oral statement, Mr. Chairman. I hope that the full statement will be made a part of the record.

[The prepared statement of Eleanor Chelimsky follows:]

United States General Accounting Office

GAO

Testimony

For Release
on Delivery
Expected at
9:30 a.m.
Wednesday
May 15, 1991

Student Aid Information and Private Tuition-Guarantee Programs

Statement of Eleanor Chelimsky
Assistant Comptroller General
Program Evaluation and Methodology Division

Before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
United States House of Representatives

GAO/T-PEMD-91-6

GAO Form 160 (12/87)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am pleased to be here today to discuss our work on student aid and early intervention.

The major federal strategy to stimulate pursuit of higher education is student aid; however, little is gained from that strategy if important information about that aid fails to reach students and their parents. Families need to be aware of the facts concerning student aid in order to accurately estimate costs, plan how to meet them, and, in the early grades, lay the academic and motivational foundations both for completing school and meeting the entrance requirements for the next level of schooling.

Currently, knowledge of available student aid is limited and inaccurate, and many students who probably could benefit from higher education end their schooling early. Specifically, the completion rate for high school has remained steady from 1977 to 1987 at about 85-86 percent, which means we are losing about 15 percent of students who never finish high school. And while the proportion of high school graduates (16 to 24 years old) enrolled in college increased somewhat in the last decade, it still stands at less than 40 percent overall (including enrollments in both 2- and 4-year colleges), and much less (only 26 percent) for black males. Thus, the combination of the educational preparation of students at the precollege level and the college financial aid that

is available to them, appear not to be stimulating much increase in the rate at which our nation's students go on to pursue higher education. Many observers contend that this situation represents a risk to the nation's future well-being.

Because of concern over the slow growth in the areas of school completion and college attendance, the Chairman of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee asked us to review what students and parents know about college costs and student aid and also to look at a variety of private-sector initiatives offering guarantees of college aid as well as other help. I am pleased that, as you begin examination of the broad area of early interventions in preparation for reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, you have given us the opportunity to discuss the results of these two studies with you.

I will focus my comments today first and more briefly on the knowledge gap, and then turn to the kinds of promising practices we found that address not only that gap but also the broader array of barriers that must be surmounted if more young people, especially those from poor and minority backgrounds, are to pursue higher education. We documented definite knowledge gaps; however, we did not make recommendations in the area of student aid information since we did not gather evidence on different methods of providing information and their relative effectiveness. In addition, we did not make recommendations about tuition-guarantee

efforts because the ones we saw were too new to have demonstrated long-term success; we do, however, have observations about key dimensions of implementation, including costs, as well as some early results.

This information is described in more detail in our two reports.[1]

My major points are as follows:

-- Students and parents have limited knowledge of the cost of attending different kinds of schools--both grossly overestimating and underestimating different cost elements. They also know surprisingly little about the availability of federal student aid, and this persists even as students pass through the last two years of high school. Minority students and their families or members of low-income families did not have markedly less information than others, though Hispanic students were the least likely to know about aid.

-- Secondary-school counselors are not generally regarded as important sources of financial aid information; higher

[1]Higher Education: Gaps in Parents' and Students' Knowledge of School Costs and Federal Aid, GAO/PEMD-90-20BR (Washington, D.C.: July 1990); Promising Practice: Private Programs Guaranteeing Student Aid for Higher Education, GAO/PEMD-90-16 (Washington, D.C.: June 1990).

education institutions were the primary source, followed by informal sources such as family members and friends.

-- Facts about the extent of knowledge of student aid need to be seen in context--that is, aid information is only one of many influences on postsecondary school motivation and choice. Academic ability, high school grades, family income, and desire to continue education are more highly related to attendance than is knowledge of aid.

-- In 1988-89, over 42,000 students were involved in private-sector programs involving early notice of guaranteed financial aid and often additional academic and other support. These programs differ greatly in their assumptions, designs, and costs.

-- Virtually none of the private programs have been going long enough to show the degree their hopes are realized, though some early data are promising in showing that programs are at least retaining youth in school. Some of the program components, such as early interventions combining intense mentoring and academic support, do seem to have the potential to markedly increase motivation and achievement. The most modest of these ("pay for grades"), which offer small financial incentives and few

services, seem least likely to affect disadvantaged youths' college attendance rates.

-- . Systematic research and evaluation are markedly absent in both of the areas we reviewed. Clearcut recommendations about the best (most efficient, most effective) action will only be possible when programs--of information-provision or broader intervention--are evaluated well.

I will turn first to a more detailed discussion of our work on student aid information and then to the tuition guarantee programs.

KNOWLEDGE OF COLLEGE COSTS AND STUDENT AID

Scope and Method

For this review, we examined available studies on students' and parents' knowledge of federal financial aid for postsecondary education. We also conducted a number of interviews and performed our own secondary analysis of available data from the High School and Beyond Survey. We examined the following four questions:

-- What is known about students' and parents' knowledge of federal financial aid at different points in time as students progress through junior high and high school?

-- Has considerable variance been found in the extent of this knowledge among different populations?

-- What sources have contributed to this knowledge?

-- What consequences can be attributed to different degrees of knowledge of federal financial aid?

In performing this synthesis, we identified potentially relevant studies done since 1980 through the use of computerized literature searches. We also contacted state educational agencies, professional groups involved with student aid, and university researchers in an effort to identify unpublished studies or data. We augmented the literature by analyzing previously unstudied data from the High School and Beyond Survey.

We found that useful evidence was scarce and had substantial shortcomings for the purposes of answering these questions. For example, many of the studies had idiosyncratic samples, old data, and low response rates, which limit generalizability. In addition, a major national study used by many authors worded one key question very ambiguously and received a low response rate as well. We only attempted to answer questions about knowledge; we did not review evaluations of information-provision programs such as hotlines or advertising campaigns (and these did not turn up often in the research as major sources of information).

Findings on the Four Questions

In answering our first question, on basic knowledge levels, we found that students and parents knew surprisingly little about financial aid for higher education or the costs of postsecondary schools. A major national study in 1980 found that only 12 percent of high school sophomores were aware of the Pell Grant program and only 8 percent were aware of Stafford Loans. The same study found that although seniors were much more likely to recognize these programs--only 18 percent were unaware of Pell Grants and 26 percent of Stafford Loans--most appeared to have only rudimentary additional information about aid programs, including those for which they might be eligible. Parents lacked information about financial aid throughout their children's junior high and high school years. Fewer than half the parents of high school seniors in 1980 were able to identify major federal financial aid programs.

We also found that students and parents held erroneous views about financial aid and school costs. Many students and parents misunderstood aid requirements and thus believed incorrectly that they were ineligible for aid. Parents and students tended to both grossly overestimate and underestimate different elements of the cost of higher education. Both kinds of mistake can lead people to limit their consideration of different school options.

On the second question, we found that there was a relation between a family's income and its level of awareness of federal financial aid. In general, students and parents from low-income families knew relatively more about Pell Grants, while those from higher-income families knew relatively more about loans. We found a similar relationship between parents' educational level and their awareness of financial-aid options. However, the differences between these groups were small.

Seeking information on the third question, on the origins of whatever information people did have, we found higher education institutions were the primary source of information about financial aid for most students and parents, followed by informal sources such as family members and friends. At least during the periods covered by the studies we reviewed, high school counselors were not generally regarded as important sources of financial aid information.

Parents are interested in learning about financial aid and thus are willing recipients of financial aid information. We found that parents, including those who were indifferent to their children's postsecondary education plans, desired to participate in financial aid information activities.

Fourth, and last, concerning the consequences of this knowledge, we found that students from families with knowledge of

financial aid at the time the students were in high school were far more likely to apply for aid than students from families without knowledge at this time. In addition, we found a relationship between knowledge of financial aid and postsecondary school attendance. Students who were aware of the availability of financial aid as high-school sophomores were more likely to enroll in a postsecondary school. We cannot conclude, however, that increased knowledge of financial aid will increase the likelihood of postsecondary enrollment. It is not possible to determine from the available studies whether knowing of financial aid availability is a precursor to the desire to pursue postsecondary education or whether the desire to continue education explains the differences in awareness of financial aid.

Though increasing knowledge of available student aid might seem an efficient way to increase college-going, in fact such knowledge is only one of many influences on students' postsecondary education decisions. Other key factors are academic ability, high school grades, family income, and motivation to continue education, each more highly related to postsecondary attendance than is knowledge of financial aid. However, it is possible that elementary and secondary school teachers and counselors may increase the probability that students will aspire to and pursue postsecondary education when they provide early and realistic information on postsecondary school costs and the many ways of meeting them.

TUITION-GUARANTEE PROGRAMS

To change the disappointing pattern of slow growth, especially among disadvantaged youth, in the rate of those going on to higher education, private individuals and organizations started programs in the 1980's that offered such students early notice of guaranteed financial aid for college and, often, additional academic and other support in preparation for further education. Early positive reports on a few programs drew wide attention but little formal evaluation.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources asked us to review current tuition-guarantee programs to determine their characteristics, the key issues facing them--and likely to face others considering starting similar efforts--as well as their results to date. We gathered data on the aims and operations of these tuition-guarantee programs, along with any evidence of program results and of factors that might affect expansion or replication elsewhere.

Background

It became evident in our analysis of the data showing limited knowledge of student aid that the decision to pursue higher

46-807 0 - 91 - 3

education involves students and their parents in weighing many factors and requires multiple steps of prior preparation reaching back years before school graduation. Clearly, more than student aid information is involved. Academic preparation for college requires selection of particular classes as early as the ninth grade; school completion requires persistence in the face of many obstacles, sometimes including peer pressure against academic effort; and college attendance requires surmounting yet additional hurdles, such as completing complex applications and paying the bills. Diverse public and private organizations work to increase the high school graduation and college attendance rates of poor and minority youth in many ways (for example, through tutoring or scholarships). In addition, such targeted federal programs as student financial aid and Upward Bound have been in existence for many years.

Some, though not all, of the guaranteed-tuition programs of the 1980's differ from earlier programs in that they constitute comprehensive efforts, starting early in the school career, to increase the chances of academic success for disadvantaged youths. These new programs combine a financial aid guarantee, personal and often intense mentoring, and a wide range of program elements aimed at increasing both motivation and academic skills so that school success would come to be both valued and feasible.

Scope and Method

To understand the programs, we gathered information by survey and site visit. We surveyed all programs that could be found in 1988-89, a total of 111, and achieved a response rate of 62 percent. The number that could not be located can only be estimated: there may have been as many as 120 others at the time we did our work, and perhaps more since then. We visited six diverse programs, and at each one discussed activities and results to date with a wide range of participants, interviewing a total of 93 people and visiting 11 schools. In addition, we examined the opportunities for sound future evaluation of the programs' results, which is especially important in light of the widely reported early successes of a few programs.

Results Promising Enough To Suggest Further Experimentation

We found the private sector programs promising because of their participants' significant efforts, the generally plausible program designs, and some early indications of positive results (largely in the area of student retention in school). Thus, we concluded that it would be reasonable to expect others to make further attempts along these lines. However, if they did so at present, they would have to proceed in general ignorance of existing programs' success in attaining some of their most important goals--for example, whether current tuition-guarantee

programs increase the access of disadvantaged students to higher education, or which of several different program models are most cost-effective in improving educational motivation and accomplishments for these students. We found that only modest data are being kept, and systematic evaluation efforts are few and uncertain. If this situation does not change, the answers to the most critical questions about the effectiveness of tuition-guarantee programs can only be impressionistic.

Program Strategies Differ, and
Some Are More Promising Than Others

We found four quite different types of programs that represent different strategies about how early the intervention should start, what type and size of student participant group should be formed, how strong the financial incentive should be, and how intensive project services should be. The most comprehensive are typically "sponsorship" programs, in which one individual or organizational donor starts to provide intensive academic help, mentoring (personal support), and other services to a small, broad-based (that is, not selected based on prior academic performance) group of students. The least intense are typically "pay-for-grades" programs, in which a donor provides few services but puts modest funds, based on students' grades, into accounts for use later in paying higher education expenses.

These programs are new. They presently reach only a tiny fraction of the nation's disadvantaged students. However, some of them appear to be achieving an important success in keeping the selected student groups intact and in school. This is a critical precondition for any other effects. Some program components--especially the early intervention, personal mentoring, and intensive academic help in "sponsorship" programs--seem to have the potential to markedly increase motivation and achievement.

Current Scale of Guarantee Programs of All Kinds

Our survey data show that in 1988-89 at least 42,496 students then in school were involved in tuition-guarantee programs. At least 2,884 additional students then enrolled in postsecondary education received a total of $1.6 million in tuition benefits. Thirty-nine programs reported a total endowment of $22.7 million to support future tuition payments. We found major differences across four types of programs, including the number of students involved, the extent of services offered, and annual operating expenses.

Differences Among Four Types of Guarantee Programs

"Sponsorship" programs were the most common of the tuition-guarantee programs, begun either by individuals or organizations. The founder of such a program typically selects one or two complete

classrooms of students at elementary or junior high school level, guarantees postsecondary tuition, and usually agrees to serve as personal mentor for the young people through the school years and to pay for support staff and related programming. These programs provide the most intensive educational services to the participating precollege students of the four program types. In 1988-89, 37 sponsorship programs responding to our survey (a rate of 53 percent) served 3,617 students at an average cost per year of $923 per student. Few of these programs have graduated students or paid out guaranteed tuition yet. However, most do report success in retaining their students in school thus far. We also saw examples of substantial extra academic help for students that could make a big difference in student achievement and motivation to go further.

"Last-dollar" programs help high school juniors and seniors learn about and apply for student aid, and also guarantee students the remaining assistance (the last dollars) needed to attend postsecondary school after all other sources of assistance have been exhausted. Staff of 12 last-dollar programs responding to our survey (a rate of 92 percent) reported that in 1988-89 they advised nearly 17,000 students at an average cost per year of $431 per student, and also paid out $1.54 million in grants to 2,389 students now in higher education. They offer few other supportive services. Several have been in operation for some years, have

helped many students, but lack evidence (other than participants' opinions) of the unique impact of these efforts.

"University-based" programs may guarantee admissions and tuition at a particular institution and also offer mentoring and other services while selected or volunteer students complete high school. A few universities operate sponsorship programs to help a selected group through high school and then guarantee tuition at any institution after graduation. In 1988-89, 16 university-based programs responded to our survey (a rate of 67 percent), and their staff reported serving almost 1,900 students with average annual expenses of $328. None of these programs has begun giving tuition benefits to graduates, but the programs generally reported success in retaining students in school.

"Pay-for-grades" programs are the fourth type of tuition-guarantee program. In these programs, tuition funds are guaranteed only if a student receives specified grades in school subjects. Staff from four of these programs (a 100 percent response rate) reported that in 1988-89 nearly 20,000 students received these rewards (payment into an account set aside for future tuition), together with relatively few support services, so that the average cost was only $111 per student. Pay-for-grades programs reported paying out funds totaling $73,000 to nearly 500 high-school graduates in 1988-89. However, because of the modest incentive they offered and (in some cases) the large percentage of

nonwinners, such programs appeared least likely to affect disadvantaged youths' college attendance rates.

Implementation Problems

Current program staff predicted that others attempting such programs would most often encounter problems finding funds to pay for current services, to hire staff, and to fund the tuition guarantees. In addition, they warned that maintaining contact with students was difficult. Sponsorship program staff often cited minimal cooperation or even resistance from family members as a barrier, though we noted that parents may reasonably be expected to resent the intrusion and competition that strong mentors may represent in a family.

Evaluation Shortcomings

Evaluation can be a tool for improving current programs, maintaining staff morale (in cases where the data are as promising as these appear to be), assisting others who are starting similar programs, as well as assessing what works and why. Yet we found some negative attitudes concerning the merits of systematic evaluation, especially of the more complex sponsorship programs. Respondents from most programs did report collecting some data, including students' school progress and grades. Data collection seems to be lagging or absent, however, on other key items, such as

test scores, school attendance, family information, and the support services used by students. The programs' current data-collection efforts do not appear to constitute comprehensive, systematic evaluations. We judge such evaluation to be essential and suggest the need for a comparison-group design. Until evidence from such evaluations is available, conclusions about the effectiveness of tuition-guarantee programs will continue to be tentative and qualified.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Although we made no specific recommendations in these two reports, I believe there are several general implications that it may be useful to highlight in my conclusion, for your consideration as you weigh the various proposals for new and expanded early intervention.

First, building evaluation into any new efforts is useful (including specific funding set-asides) in view of the gaps we found in the current knowledge of what works and the minimal effort commonly devoted to evaluation in the absence of specific direction. Comparison-group designs are vital, but they require special care and long-term effort to be carried out properly (owing to the need to keep in touch with similar youths not enrolled in the program to learn of their educational outcomes).

Second, the uncertainty over the effect of information alone on student and parent decisions suggests that we should not let our hopes get too high concerning the positive effects of information strategies alone, despite their appearance of potential cost-efficiency. Though information improvement is a highly plausible strategy, we know little of the most effective ways to implement it, and success in overcoming barriers to higher education probably requires earlier and more powerful interventions than those based on information alone. On the other hand, given the fact that federal student aid does exist, it is clear that its maximum usefulness depends on parents' and students' awareness, very early on, of its availability. And, given the additional fact that our data show a substantial lack of this awareness, what this suggests is a real need to reconceptualize our federal student aid programs to emphasize outreach and dissemination of information about what resources are available much earlier and in a much broader way than has hitherto been done.

And third, despite the undeniable importance of reducing the cost barriers to higher education access, we heard repeatedly from those involved in the guarantee efforts that "the tuition guarantee isn't the major factor." They were saying that even when the cost (to the students) of higher education approaches zero, personal and academic support are needed to bring the young people to the doorstep of higher education and to move them beyond it successfully. Our evidence of the extraordinary efforts being made

in the most comprehensive "sponsorship" programs to provide the extent of support the programs' designers believe is needed (extra weeks and months of supplementary schooling; nights, weekends, and summers of close guidance and activities)--at an average cost of about $900 per year per student, starting in junior high school--suggests the level of effort that may be needed more generally. Our study does indicate the importance and the potential of having private-sector help in this effort, but it is obvious that the journey will be long and costly if this is the path we must take. Yet to do less than what is necessary is not really a viable solution, either for our students or for our nation in the context of the broader issues of domestic productivity and international competitiveness that confront us now and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

This concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman. I will be glad to answer any questions that you and the other members of the Subcommittee may have.

Mr. SAWYER. It will, as will that of all of the witnesses. We appreciate, given the exhaustive character of your testimony, your willingness to summarize.

Let me depart from normal practice and note that our full committee chairman, in whose stead I stand this morning, has joined us. Because he will have to depart soon for other business, let me call on him to see whether he has any comments he would like to add at this point. Mr. Ford?

Mr. FORD OF MICHIGAN. I want to thank you, Mr. Sawyer, for making it possible for us to go ahead with the hearing while I have so many other things happening this morning. I appreciate your help. They're going to come and get me again in a moment, and I'll get back as soon as I can.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you.

Our next witness is Dr. Cornelius Foley, who is the president of the State of New York Higher Education Services Corporation. Dr. Foley?

Mr. FOLEY. Good morning. My name is Neil Foley, and I am President of the New York State of Higher Education Services Corporation, our state's student financial aid agency.

I thank you for the opportunity to testify, on behalf of New York State Governor Mario M. Cuomo, at this hearing regarding the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Many of us who have studied our nation's higher education system feel that this reauthorization will indeed be one that will be pivotal to the future of our nation.

This reauthorization also represents an immense opportunity for experimentation, innovation, and change. One such innovation that has proven to be extremely successful has been the I Have A Dream program, which was initiated by the New York businessman Eugene Lang. The essence of that program has become the model for many private and public programs, albeit in small numbers and scale. For example, Michigan has its TIP program, Rhode Island has its Children's Crusade program, Louisiana has announced the Taylor program, and Indiana has the 21st Century Scholarship program.

In 1989–1990, New York State began the first part of its two-part comprehensive program, the Liberty Scholarship and Partnership Program. The partnerships have been in operation for 2 years and involve grants to colleges and consortia for competitively selected programs aimed at identifying at-risk youth and developing comprehensive mentor and counseling programs for those children, to encourage them to stay in school and graduate from high school.

The second part of the program, the Liberty Scholarship, was soon to be implemented and has only recently been delayed because of funding shortfalls at the state level. It will involve a grant which, in combination with other grants, will cover the basic costs of attendance at a public college. When joined with the mentoring, counseling, and tutoring available through the partnerships, it should provide a powerful incentive to stay in school and attend college.

Because of the newness of these programs, not many comprehensive evaluations of them are available. However, the Government

Accounting Office, in June of 1990, issued a study of such programs which was appropriately titled, "Promising Practice." The report concluded that early intervention and tuition guarantee programs form a "dramatic demonstration," and "important potential outcomes" that bear watching. However, the report also indicated that funding is the primary problem in sustaining these efforts.

I am here today to respectfully urge your consideration of a proposal to build upon the success of existing early intervention programs through a National Liberty Scholarship and Partnership program. This proposal, which is about to be introduced by Congresswoman Nita Lowey, would provide matching grants to assist states in mounting or expanding comprehensive early intervention and outreach services for at-risk youth, and programs to virtually guarantee a college education for low-income students through a comprehensive government grant package.

Under the Liberty Partnership component, states could mobilize colleges, universities, schools, nonprofit organizations, and business groups into cooperative partnerships designed to provide comprehensive supportive services which include skills assessment, academic, personal, and financial counseling, tutoring, and, most importantly, mentoring. The objective of the program would be to keep students in school and supply them with the support and information necessary to prepare them for college.

The Liberty Scholarship component would provide matching grants to states to provide an early guarantee of expanded grant aid for college-bound youngsters from poor families. The Liberty Scholarship program would provide grant aid in addition to Pell grants, SSIG grants, and state grants to provide the poorest students with annual funding equal to at least 75 percent of the basic cost of attendance at a public 4 year college. Grants could be used at either public or independent colleges.

The proposal is drafted so as to target funding at students whose family income places them that at or near the Federal poverty level, with the Liberty Scholarship award reduced by one-half of the amount by which the adjusted gross income of the student's family exceeds the Federal poverty level. States would apply for National Liberty funding through the submission of a state plan.

The partnership component would be administered by the state's education or higher education department, while the scholarship component would be administered by the state financial aid agency responsible for SSIG program administration. An administrative cost allowance would be included for both components of the program, defined as 5 percent of program funds, a rate which is comparable to the Federal campus-based programs. As noted before, many states have demonstrated their willingness to provide matching funds for this kind of program.

The proposal seeks to target the new aid money at a specifically defined student population. It defines "qualified student" as one who is less than 22 years of age at the time of the first grant award, who is receiving a Pell grant, who is a recipient of a high school diploma or an equivalency, and who attends a degree-granting institution.

We realize that some proponents of the National Liberty concept would like to serve a wider population. However, because of obvi-

ous resource limitations, the initial Liberty program has been targeted accordingly.

Congress should be pleased by the very positive response that the proposal has received from many quarters, including several governors, and representatives from education agencies and associations nationwide. As recently as last month, Congresswoman Lowey's staff and our staff met with representatives of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, the American Council on Education, the United States Student Association, the National Governors' Association, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and reworked the draft bill to reflect their suggestions.

This subcommittee will, no doubt, also review several other bills and current programs that address the areas of early intervention, improved information, counselor training, dropout prevention, and improved college opportunities, and which would involve local educational agencies, trust funds, and individual colleges and schools.

We feel that it is important to have the statewide coordination inherent in Congresswoman Lowey's National Liberty proposal, within a Federal-state funding partnership, as it offers a uniform national impact that may not be possible under the other proposals. Many of the other ideas and bills in this area have great merit and could work together to address this urgent need.

We commend to you the idea of a National Liberty Scholarship/Partnership Program. We strongly believe that it is a viable program initiative for this subcommittee to consider in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The program, as we understand it, will directly address the compelling needs of our nation's youth, while building upon past program successes.

It offers the simplicity of administration and student understanding that, quite frankly, all of us desire. And it recognizes that the money to do the job right now is not entirely at either the state or Federal level alone, but that together, a new partnership can be forged to achieve new triumphs.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

[The prepared statement of Cornelius Foley follows:]

Testimony to the U.S. House of Representatives
Postsecondary Education Subcommittee on
Early Intervention Programs for the Reauthorization
of the Federal Higher Education Act

by

Dr. Cornelius J. Foley
President
New York State Higher Education Services Corporation
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12255

Presented on

May 15, 1991
Washington, D.C.

Good morning. My name is Neil Foley and I am President of the New York State Higher Education Services Corporation (NYSHESC), our State's student financial aid agency.

I thank you for the opportunity to testify, on behalf of New York State Governor Mario M. Cuomo, at this hearing regarding the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Many of us who have studied our nation's higher education system feel that this reauthorization will indeed be one that will be pivotal to the future of our nation.

We continue to see research which disturbs us:

- federal spending for student higher education grants, in terms of constant (inflation adjusted) dollars, is down over 34% during the decade of the 80's;
- participation in college education by poor students and underrepresented minority students is also down;
- the gap in high school graduation rates between high and low income students and between minority and "majority" student groups is not improving despite a record amount of funding being spent at the elementary and secondary school level;
- and, demographic experts predict that by the end of the century, proportionately more children will be born into single-parent, poverty households, with low educational attainment expectations.

Such a research framework clearly describes major challenges for us to consider during this reauthorization effort.

Of course it also represents an immense opportunity for experimentation, innovation, and change. One such innovation that has proven to be extremely successful has been the "I Have A Dream" program, which was initiated by the New York businessman, Eugene Lang. The essence of that program has become the model for many private and public programs, albeit in small numbers and scale. For example, Michigan has its TIP program, Rhode Island has its "Children's Crusade" program, Louisiana has announced its Taylor Program, and Indiana has the 21st Century Scholarship program.

In 1989-90, New York State began the first part of its two-part comprehensive program, the Liberty Scholarship and Partnership Program. The partnerships have been in operation for two years, and involve grants to colleges and consortia for competitively selected programs aimed at identifying at-risk youth and developing comprehensive mentor and counseling programs for these children to encourage them to stay in school and graduate from high school. The second part of the program, the Liberty Scholarship, was soon to be implemented and has only recently been delayed because of funding shortfalls at the State level. It will involve a grant which, in combination with other grants, will cover the basic costs-of-attendance at a public college. When joined with the mentoring, counseling and tutoring available through the partnerships, it should provide a powerful incentive to stay in school and attend college.

Because of the newness of these programs, not many comprehensive evaluations of them are available. However, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Government Accounting Office (GAO), in June 1990, issued a study of such programs which was appropriately titled, "Promising Practice". The report noted, and I agree, that more education benefits everyone in the nation, not just those who stay in school longer and get the degree. It went on to say that benefits to a society of a more educated workforce and citizenry are undoubted and provide the basic rationale for interest in the results of these kinds of programs. The report indicated that private counseling and tuition guarantee programs do report improved student retention and considerable success in improving high school graduation rates and college attendance among disadvantaged populations. The report notes other successes beyond retention, as school staff indicated that the targeted children had improved school attendance, test scores, and reading skills. The report concluded that early intervention and tuition guarantee programs form a "dramatic demonstration", and "important potential outcomes" that bear watching. However, the report also indicated that funding is the primary problem in sustaining these efforts.

I am here today to respectfully urge your consideration of a proposal to build upon the success of existing early intervention programs through a National Liberty Scholarship and Partnership program. This proposal, which is about to be introduced by Congresswoman Nita Lowey, would provide matching grants to assist states in mounting or expanding comprehensive early intervention and outreach services for at-risk youth, and programs to

virtually guarantee a college education for low-income students through a comprehensive government grant package.

Under the Liberty Partnership component, states could mobilize colleges, universities, schools, non-profit organizations, and business groups into cooperative partnerships designed to provide comprehensive supportive services which include: skills assessment; academic, personal, and financial counseling; tutoring; and, most importantly, mentoring. The objective of the program would be to keep students in school and supply them with the support and information necessary to prepare them for college.

The Liberty Scholarship component would provide matching grants to states to provide an early guarantee of expanded grant aid for college-bound youngsters from poor families. The Liberty Scholarship program would provide grant aid in addition to Pell Grants, SSIG grants, and State grants to provide the poorest students with annual funding equal to at least 75% of the basic costs-of-attendance at a public 4-year college. Grants could be used at either public or independent colleges.

The proposal offers simplicity in that it would build upon the administrative mechanism currently in place for the federal State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) program. But it is not intended to replace SSIG. Instead, it is intended to complement the SSIG program, similar to the way that the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) program complements the Pell Grant program.

The proposal offers flexibility for the states as they would have the option to use up to [illegible] of their allotment for the counseling and mentoring programs. States would also have the option to provide students grants equal to 75% - 100% of basic public sector costs-of-attendance. States would be able to draw upon non-government, private sources of support, and could include tuition waivers and other in-kind contributions as part of the State's matching requirement.

The proposal is drafted so as to target funding at students whose family income places them at, or near the federal poverty level, with the Liberty Scholarship award reduced by one-half of the amount by which the adjusted gross income of the student's family exceeds the federal poverty level. States would apply for National Liberty funding through the submission of a State plan. The Partnership component would be administered by the state's education or higher education department, while the scholarship component would be administered by the state financial aid agency responsible for SSIG program administration. An administrative cost allowance would be included for both components of the program, defined as 5% of program funds - a rate which is comparable to the federal campus-based programs. As noted before, many states have demonstrated their willingness to provide matching funds for this kind of program.

The proposal seeks to target the new aid money at a specifically defined student population. It defines "qualified student" as one who is less than 22 years of age at the time of first grant award, who is receiving a Pell Grant if Pell

eligible, who is a recent recipient of a high school diploma or [illegible], and who attends a degree-granting institution. We realize that some proponents of the Liberty concept would like to serve a wider population. However, because of obvious resource limitations, the initial Liberty program has been targeted accordingly.

Estimates of the cost of the Liberty program, when it is assumed that all states were to participate immediately (a very unlikely occurrence), reflect an initial year federal costs in the neighborhood of $191 million. When fully phased-in, the federal share would be roughly $529 million, again assuming all states participated to the fullest extent allowed by the program. While that is a significant sum, it is only 22% of what the federal government spent for guaranteed student loan program defaults last year, and is just under 10% of the annual Pell Grant appropriation.

Congress should be pleased by the very positive response that the proposal has received from many quarters, including several governors, and representatives from educational agencies and associations nationwide. As recently as last month, Congresswoman Lowey's staff and ours met with representatives of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), American Council on Education (ACE), United States Student Association (USSA), National Governors' Association (NGA), National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), and the American Association of Community

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and Junior Colleges and reworked the draft bill to reflect their suggestions.

This subcommittee will no doubt also review several other bills and current programs that address the areas of early intervention, improved information, counselor training, drop-out prevention, and improved college opportunities, and which would involve local educational agencies, trust funds, and individual colleges and schools. We feel that it is important to have the statewide coordination inherent in Congresswoman Lowey's National Liberty proposal, within a federal-state funding partnership, as it offers a uniform national impact that may not be possible under the other proposals. Many of the other ideas and bills in this area have great merit and could work together to address this urgent need.

We commend to you the idea of a National Liberty Scholarship/Partnership Program. We strongly believe that it is a viable program initiative for this subcommittee to consider in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The program, as we understand it, will directly address the compelling needs of our nation's youth, while building upon past program successes. It offers the simplicity of administration and student understanding that, quite frankly, all of us desire in this business. And, it recognizes that the money to do the job right is not entirely available at either the state or federal level alone; but, that together, a new partnership can be forged to achieve new triumphs.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I would be glad to answer any questions.

- 8 -

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you very much, Dr. Foley.

Our next witness is Kristine MacDermott. I'm going to just take a moment to pause and introduce her. She is from my congressional district, so I get to do that sort of thing. She is the Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management at the University of Akron, in the 14th congressional district of Ohio. She oversees the Office of Admissions and Student Financial Aid. She chaired the Ohio American College Testing Advisory Committee, responsible for creating a state-wide early intervention program for 8th graders.

I think that while she's especially well-placed to talk about early intervention, she brings a perspective that stretches all the way from middle school through college admissions. So I'm particularly pleased to welcome you here, Kristine, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Ms. MACDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, it's my pleasure, as you've mentioned, to be here at your invitation today to talk about the importance of early intervention activities, and to address, specifically, support for the components of H.R. 1524, the Student Counseling and Assistance Network Act.

As you've mentioned, I oversee, at the University of Akron, the offices of Student Admissions, Financial Aid, Orientation, and Retention. And in dealing with those points at an institution such as the University of Akron—we are the third largest public university in Ohio, with an enrollment of over 30,000 students—it is very obvious to us each year as our entering freshmen begin, that there are some serious deficiencies that they have received in middle and high schools.

That is especially clear to us when we look and work very closely with the guidance professionals in our area, and see all of the other things that are distractions and are competing for their time. So the problem is not so much a criticism or an indictment of what goes on in our middle and high school guidance offices as much as it is, simply, a reaction and a product of the many other very serious kinds of circumstances dealing from emotional and psychological counseling to substance abuse to the routine matters of the day that those staffs must get through in each 8 to 10 hour period.

As a large public university that is committed to access for students, we struggle with these issues especially because we enroll a large number of students each year that we would describe as the underprepared group, academically, to enter the university in addition to students who come to us from rural and urban areas, who are bringing with them a number or other kinds of personal constraints.

As we try to provide access to those students and look at ways that we can support the guidance community and work with middle and high schools in our area, it is clear to us that this particular bill gives us some of the mechanisms and support that we need in order to do that.

I would like to mention, just briefly, some of the things that SCAN, H.R. 1524, provides, that we are in support of. The first of those elements is the transitional help that students need at two very pivotal points in their academic careers. First, is their transition from middle school to high school, and second is their transition from high school to postsecondary education.

The second thing that students have great need for is greater information in preparing for college. There is no greater point in time that a student makes good or bad choices than when they become a 7th and 8th grader. And there is no way for us to stress enough, and to get to them good enough information that tells them that a single course they register for as an 8th grader can determine their success throughout high school years and throughout college years.

The third point that is addressed in SCAN is the importance of the role of greater information on financial aid. Ms. Chelimsky has already referenced for you the recent studies that have been done that point to the great disparity in the kind of information and perceptions that students and parents across the country have in reference to knowing about financial aid programs and judging their eligibility for those programs.

And finally, SCAN begins to address some of the problems that we see on a day-to-day basis at the University of Akron for our underserved populations: minority students who are in urban environments, students who come to us from some of the most rural areas of Ohio, and those who come to us academically underprepared. It creates the mechanism to identify model programs that can then be introduced to schools across the country who might want to incorporate those same programs into their guidance activities and solicit the help of business and/or colleges and universities in their areas to promote and provide service in those programs. And it creates that funding to give them the resources that they need to make those programs happen.

I would like to reference for you a couple of examples in our particular area and in the State of Ohio, that demonstrate some important points. American College Testing, in the last 2 years, worked with a group of guidance counselors and admissions professionals from across Ohio to create a program called "Making High School Count." It was targeted specifically at 8th grade students in the middle and junior high schools across Ohio to work with them in their curriculum planning, to help them identify dreams of achieving postsecondary education, and to plan curriculum accordingly.

Last year, I am very proud to tell you that 45,000 8th graders in the State of Ohio received that information and went through the Making High School Count program. However, in reporting that number to you, I must also clarify it by saying that that is still less than a third of all of the 8th graders across the State of Ohio.

In our own local area, the University of Akron has a program in place called "STEP," the Striving Toward Excellence Program, which has been funded through a large grant from the Firestone Corporation. It enables us, as a University, to provide intensive summer programs and then a continuing program throughout the school year for 65 middle school students from the Akron public schools and their parents.

While its success has been great, and the students in that program are moving forward very positively, it still has the limitation of serving only 65 students. Similar programs across the State of Ohio, like the Young Scholars program at the Ohio State University, the efforts of the Cleveland Scholarship Service in the Cleve-

land public schools, and the I Know I Can programs in Columbus and Cincinnati, also are enjoying success, but have the same limitation of serving limited numbers of students.

What is needed are broader scope, broader based programs that will allow the kind of help and support that these students need to be made available to them not only across the State of Ohio, but across our country.

The final thing that I would like to support strongly that is in the SCAN legislation is the importance that it implies on financial aid information that needs to be available to students and parents. I can't stress to you enough how many students there are who enroll at our university each year for whom financial aid is, literally, the determining factor in their attendance. So often, as we get into April, May, June, and July of each year, as we are right now, we see many, many late applicants to the university in our freshman class who are coming, who need financial aid, but who have been completely uninformed about the process and the viability of using it to help them achieve educational goals.

We, as a university, scramble at this time of the year to try to provide the opportunity for those students to still attend and to make up for all of the monies that have already been dispersed and that are no longer available to try to find some other source that will still give those students the opportunity that they need. But that's a difficult task and one that we are not always 100 percent successful at.

SCAN provides that solution to that through both the information source and network that will be available to parents and students, and also the important level of training that will be available to the guidance professionals that are dealing with the students much earlier on.

In conclusion, I would simply like to say that I represent the group of higher education professionals who are committed to providing opportunities for America's youth to pursue postsecondary education. College is probably not an appropriate goal for every student who finishes high school in the United States, but it is an appropriate goal for many, and for many who are not seeing the opportunity to achieve it. That's true in Akron, that's true across our state, it's true across our nation.

We need to be committed to allowing students to achieve that goal. We need the tools, as professionals, to make that happen, and students have the rights to expect us to have those tools. They have the right to have better financial aid information, they have the right to have well-trained counselors and staff available to them, and then they have the right to know that there are good programs in place that will allow them to move successfully through the middle school years to high school and into postsecondary education. I believe that the provisions of SCAN begin to make all of that possible.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Kristine MacDermott follows:]

TESTIMONY OF

KRISTINE G. MACDERMOTT
ASSISTANT PROVOST FOR ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
UNIVERSITY OF AKRON, OHIO

Before the Education and Labor Committee
Postsecondary Education Subcommittee

United States House of Representatives

May 15, 1991

Kristine G. MacDermott

Kristine G. MacDermott, M.A., Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, is a native Ohioan. She earned a bachelor's degree in communication from David Lipscomb University in Nashville, Tennessee and a master's degree in communication from The University of Akron.

In her current position, Mrs. MacDermott oversees the offices of Admissions, Student Financial Aid and Employment, and Orientation and Retention. She chaired the Ohio American College Testing (ACT) High School Advisory Committee responsible for creating a statewide early intervention program for eighth graders.

Currently, she serves as the Legislative and Professional Concerns Committee chairperson for the Ohio Association of College Admission Counselors; and serves as a member of the Government Relations Advisory Committee of the National Association of College Admission Counselors; and the Ohio ACT Assembly Executive Committee.

Mrs. MacDermott is married to Geoffrey K. MacDermott, Director of Technical and Engineering Services at General Tire and Rubber Company. They have two daughters and one son.

Mr. Chairman, I am Kristine MacDermott, Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management at the University of Akron in Akron, Ohio. The University of Akron, located in a metropolitan area of approximately 300,000, is the third largest public university in Ohio, enrolling over 30,000 students.

I am very pleased to be here today to support the components of the Student Counseling and Assistance Network Act of 1991--H.R. 1524. As a professional in higher education who oversees the admissions, financial aid, orientation, and retention areas, I am acutely aware of the lack of information and guidance to which students have access prior to making plans and choices in reference to postsecondary education.

Serious deficiencies exist in the level of precollege guidance offered to students in their middle and high school years. This is not necessarily the fault to their teachers and counselors, but rather a product of the numerous other constraints and demands on the time of these educators---demands such as test administration, substance and physical abuse situations, emotional and psychological counseling, requirements of administrative procedures, the daily issues of course scheduling, hall and lunchroom monitoring, and college counseling. It is easy to understand how, in many instances, college counseling falls to the bottom of the priority list when stacked against these other serious and urgent issues.

The SCAN bill creates the opportunity for us to support educators and students in their quest to become more knowledgeable and more active in choices which favor postsecondary education. SCAN addresses four predominant student needs at the middle and high school levels.

1. Students need help with the transition from middle/junior high school to high school and from high school to college. The decisions made by students at this point are pivotal in determining the direction of their adult lives.

2. Students need early information about what it means to prepare for and attend college. They need a clear understanding of how courses taken in the eighth grade can determine success in both high school and college.

3. Students need to understand the role that financial aid can play in assisting them to achieve their postsecondary goals. Recent studies have shown that students across the country are unaware of the various aid programs, grossly misjudge their eligibility for financial aid.

4. These needs are most severe among minority students, students from rural and urban areas who suffer economic disadvantage, and the academically underprepared. The lack of services and programs to assist them leads to their continued underrepresentation at our colleges and universities.

One of the primary ingredients of the SCAN bill is the identification of model early intervention programs across the country, the description of these programs to other schools who may want to make them a part of guidance activities, and the funding to help support these efforts through grant application. This type of information would be invaluable to both secondary schools, and colleges and universities who could take the initiative to work more closely with students in preparing for college entry.

Several examples of programs like this exist in Ohio and in the Akron area. First, American College Testing, through the work of an Ohio statewide committee of high school and college people, initiated a project called "Making High School Count." This project is directed at eighth graders as they begin the curriculum selection process for high school, directing them toward the courses that will best prepare them for college-level work. This year over 45,000 students were advised through this program. Although that number sounds large, it represents less than a third of Ohio's eighth grade students.

A second example is the STEP or Striving Toward Excellence Program at The University of Akron. This program, funded through a large grant from the Firestone Corporation, provides early intervention and advising activities for middle school students and their parents in the Akron Public Schools. It is an important method for assisting some of the underserved population in the Akron area. The unfortunate part of this effort is that it has the ability to reach only 65 students.

Similar programs in Ohio, like the Young Scholars Program at The Ohio State University, the efforts of the Cleveland Scholarship Service in The Cleveland Public Schools, and the "I Know I Can" programs in Columbus and Cincinnati, are further examples of local early intervention efforts. But all suffer from the same restriction that the STEP program does, and that is their inability to serve more than a very limited population. SCAN resolves that dilemma by providing information and opportunities to school systems everywhere to begin similar support programs.

The other important ingredient in SCAN is the provision for more complete information on financial aid programs through counselor training and better dissemination procedures to schools and communities. Not enough can be said about the need for students, their parents, and counselors to have complete information about financial aid programs. Financial assistance is often the determining factor in a needy student's ability to attend college versus employment at a low skills, minimum-wage job.

Each year at The University of Akron, we struggle to enroll entering students who, because of a lack of information about aid and the process, are late in application. By the time we learn of these cases, monies have run out and we scramble to try to assist them in fulfilling the goal of enrollment. Each year at The University of Akron, we hold several informational training sessions for guidance counselors in our area. The session on financial aid is always the best attended, indicating the desire for current information on this topic. But the 100 plus counselors who can free their schedules for the day represent less than a fourth of those in our service area and are often not the counselors from the inner city or rural environments where we know the information may be needed most desperately.

To fill this gap, several companies now exist that offer financial aid and scholarships information to students and parents at sizeable fees. What is sold by these firm is often inaccurate and not useful to the students. It is a profit-motivated effort in the midst of what should be unobligated service to students. Many colleges and universities are attempting to take over this role to provide the information at minimal

fees to meet the need. These examples illustrate the confusing and inadequate information sources on financial assistance. SCAN provides two solutions to this problem--an information network and the training of professionals in the schools.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I represent the higher education professionals who are committed to providing the kind of information and service to students that will allow them to successfully complete their middle and high school years and move on to their goal of postsecondary education.

Although college may not be an appropriate goal for all students, it is a goal that must be achieved by more of the students in Akron, in Ohio, and across the country in order for our country to develop educationally and economically.

Secondary school counselors and college admissions professionals need the programs, tools, and resources offered through SCAN to impact the lives and decisions of young people. Students in American schools have the right to have at their disposal accurate, easy-to-understand information on financial aid, to have well-trained counselors prepared to help them with college planning, and to have programs available that compensate for some of the other constraints in their lives, and lead them to choices for more meaningful contributions educationally and occupationally. SCAN provides a means to achieve these goals for students.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you very much for your testimony this morning.

Our next witness is Arnoldo Rodriguez, Principal from McAllen, Texas.

Mr. Rodriguez, welcome.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Good morning Mr. Sawyer, members of the subcommittee. My name is Arnoldo Rodriguez. I am here to share some of my experience as a migrant student, and to describe the impact that both the High School Equivalency Program and the College Assistance Migrant Program have had on my life, personally and professionally.

I come from a large family who migrated to the State of Michigan every year. During this time, it was very difficult for me to perform at the same level, academically, as my peers. While I always made good grades toward the beginning of the school year in Michigan, the steady progress was interrupted by the family movement back to the Rio Grande Valley.

Once in the valley, it became very difficult to maintain the positive momentum with which I had started the school year. Teachers and administrators expected that an adjustment be made without a transition period and that performance be equal to that of the norm—that is, equal to that of students who had started school on day one without having to devote some of their time to laboring in the fields.

I was able to meet this expectation, but only with great difficulty and at the expense of my grades. When we would return to the Valley, I would be placed in a vocational track. This always gave me the impression that because I was a migrant, that I would have to fulfill the expectation of being a laborer. To further reinforce this self-fulfilling prophecy, the encouragement of pursuing a college education was never provided.

While I was a junior in high school, I experienced the most severe sense of failure ever. Upon returning from Michigan, I enrolled at the local high school. The adjustment went well that year until I was summoned to the counselor's office where he informed me that I had been taking the wrong history class and that I needed to change courses.

This was very disappointing to me in that I had maintained an A average in the class. However, I approached it positively as I accepted the fact that this was one of the drawbacks of being a migrant student. I anxiously awaited seventh period so I could meet my new teacher and do whatever needed to be done so that I could perform satisfactorily.

Upon arriving to my seventh period class, my new teacher told me that I had lots of catching up to do. I was assigned ten chapters of American History on Monday, and was told to be ready to take a test on Friday, since I needed to be at the same level as everyone else in the classroom.

This was quite devastating to me, and I began to feel quite pressured. I began to feel as though school was not the place for me. This feeling had surfaced previously, as my older siblings had all dropped out of school.

To further add to the helplessness and the feeling of failure and inferiority, my grades began to suffer in the other areas as well. As

46-807 0 - 91 - 4

a consequence, I made the decision not to come back to school. This was an appealing decision for me at the time, since I would be able to help my parents financially.

The tradition in the family was to help the family out financially as much as possible, since my parents did not have much education and relied on all of us to help out. When I made this decision, I conformed to the norm in keeping with the migrant dropout cycle which existed in my family.

I set out to look for a job and worked in the fields as much as I could. I was not very successful when I attempted to find a job. The first question each prospective employer asked related to my level of education. It didn't take me long to discover that once people found out that I was a high school dropout, it gave them the license and authority to treat me less than human. They humiliated me and blatantly gave me no hope of employment.

After putting up with much humiliation and embarrassment, I decided to try to obtain a high school equivalency diploma. The intent was solely for the purpose of finding a job and to deal with the rejection that I had already become accustomed to.

I had previously heard of the High School Equivalency Program at Pan American University and decided to enroll. Upon acceptance into the program, I realized that I was given a second opportunity at an education. I knew that I would have to take advantage of it and work extremely hard.

This was not hard to accomplish as, from the onset, plenty of encouragement was provided by the teachers, counselors, and administrators. It was obvious that the staff held high expectations of me and of every student. They kept telling us that we could achieve and continually provided the reassurance that we would be able to pass the GED test.

In addition to an attitude that nurtured a high degree of enthusiasm and motivation, teachers would help us with study skills, adjustment to an academic setting, and advised us on our areas of personal and academic strengths as well as exploring possible careers.

The highly personalized instruction was structured in such a way that teachers epitomized each of our successes so that we would feel good about each and every small accomplishment. This helped me develop a very positive self-concept. I felt good about my school work and about the possibility of graduating from the program.

I felt that I could not let my teachers down, as they expected quite a bit from me and had invested much time and effort in preparing me for my test. I owed them and could repay them by showing to them that their expectations would be realized.

When the day of the test came, I approached it with great confidence. Once the results came back, I found out that I had scored in the top ten amongst my group. I felt proud of myself, and most importantly, came to the realization that anything is possible, provided the right kind of positive external reinforcement is provided. I had received plenty of positive reinforcement in the program.

Upon graduating from the program, I once again, set out to look for a job. It was a great feeling to tell prospective employers that I held a high school equivalency diploma. I was no longer humiliated by having to tell people that I did not finish high school. I found a

job with a local freight company where I worked as a freight clerk. It did not come as a surprise to me that my teachers from the HEP program kept in touch with me to see how I was doing.

What did come as a surprise to me was that one of my teachers came to my place of employment one day and informed me that I could apply for a scholarship for college. She further told me that she and all the teachers at the HEP program had plenty of confidence in me, and that I could do well in college.

While I was in high school, no one had ever mentioned the possibility of my attending college or provided that type of encouragement. I had to let the thought ferment, since I was being provided with an expectation that was never held of me by any of my teachers in high school. After some thought, I decided to quit my job and to accept a scholarship to attend Saint Edward's University in Austin, Texas through the College Assistance Migrant Program.

The decision to leave the Rio Grande Valley and my family to attend Saint Edward's University was not an easy one for me or for my family to accept. My family could no longer depend on me to assist financially. Furthermore, I had never been away from the family. I knew that, once again, some very special people, including my parents and my family, held high expectations and had plenty of faith in me. I could not let them down since they all wanted the best for me.

Once at Saint Edward's, I felt the same feeling I had experienced while at the HEP program. Counselors, tutors, and peer counselors were always available to provide the encouragement to continue. Much of the encouragement was provided in the form of tutorial sessions, study skills development classes, and peer counseling sessions where adjustment problems were discussed as well as following-up on the application of study skills.

The financial help provided by the program and Saint Edward's University in the form of scholarships, grants, loans, and the work-study program ensured that very basic needs were addressed so that our main emphasis would continue to be our studies. All these people and their actions and attitudes had a significant impact on my success in college and, ultimately, my success in my profession and in life. Because of their continued and persistent encouragement, I graduated from the university with honors and the distinction of cum laude after 4 long years of hard work.

It is because of my experiences as a migrant youngster and growing up in a disadvantaged environment that I decided to choose a career in the field of education. I chose to make it my goal in life to work with children with similar backgrounds to those of mine, so that I could provide them with very much needed encouragement and make a difference in their lives, as many people had made in mine.

Cognizant of the fact that I am an exception to the cycle of dropouts, I continue my attempts to make a difference for children. As a successful elementary school principal, I am of the philosophy that all children can learn. I have used my expertise as an instructional leader to impact those children who traditionally score on the bottom 25th percentile of the norm referenced test. I am aware that these are the students who need to experience academic success or they, too, will become at risk of dropping out of school.

For these reasons, I have high expectations of my students and my staff. I attribute my success in my career, however, to those people who touched my life in a very special way. It all started with the people at the HEP program at Pan American University and continued with the staff members at the CAMP program at Saint Edward's University. The expectations that they inspired continues to this day.

While I have acquired a Masters' degree and am a successful school administrator, I realize that the sky is the limit. Recently, I was promoted to a Central Office administrative position where I coordinate the drug education program for the McAllen independent school district. This position is key in ensuring that at-risk youngsters are ensured success in school and in life through the provision of a preventive, developmentally-based, age-appropriate educational program that will decrease the chances that students experiment with drugs.

I have acquired some hours toward my doctoral degree, and plan to continue to make a difference for disadvantaged children, and am more than happy to serve as a role model for other migrant students to emulate. If I can make a difference in the life of one at-risk student by persuading him to stay in school, or to reform a dropout, then the effort has been more than worth it.

It is my contention that if my former high school teachers had the same kind of vision that the staff held at both the HEP and CAMP programs, many migrant youth could have been spared from a life of poverty which is a result of the lack of success in school.

As you may see, the positive impact that both these programs have had on my life has, as a consequence, impacted many other lives as well, the lives of the students I work with, and the lives of my family members. Since I was the first in my family to acquire a high school equivalency diploma, my two younger brothers who followed also finished high school and attended college.

As a successful product of both the High School Equivalency Program and the College Assistance Migrant Program, migrant education and, in particular, the HEP and CAMP programs are very dear to me. I hold a special place in my heart for these programs, since they have impacted many other lives as they did mine. I feel it is incumbent on me to serve as a role model to others whenever the opportunity arises.

However, I also feel it is incumbent on this subcommittee to acknowledge the successful outcomes of programs such as HEP and CAMP, and to exercise whatever power or influence you may have, collectively or individually, to not only continue providing funding for these programs, but to continue to identify innovative and successful programs so that migrant education may continue to be enhanced and many more migrant students impacted.

I thank you for the opportunity.

[The prepared statement of Arnoldo Rodriguez follows:]

HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAM AND COLLEGE ASSISTANCE MIGRANT PROGRAM

by

Arnoldo Rodriguez

FORMER HEP/CAMP STUDENT

[redacted]
Presentaton Script
HEP/CAMP Programs
National Commission on Migrant Education

My name is Arnoldo Rodriguez, I am here to share some of my experiences as a migrant student and to describe the impact that both the High School Equivalency Program and the College Assistance Migrant Program have had on my life.

I come from a large family who migrated to the state of Michigan every year. During this time, it was very difficult for me to perform at the same level academically as my peers. While I always made good grades toward the beginning of the school year in Michigan; the steady progress was interupted by the family movement back to the Rio Grande Valley. Once in the valley, it became very difficult to maintain the positive momentum with which I had started the school year. Teachers and administrators expected that an adjustment be made without a transition period and that performance be equal to that of the norm, that is, equal to that of students who had started school on day one without having to devote some of their time to laboring in the fields. I was able to meet this expectation but only with great difficulty and at the expense of my grades. When we would return to the Valley, I would be placed in a vocational track. This always gave me the impression that because I was a migrant, that I would have to fufill the expectation of being a laborer. To further reinforce this self-fulfilling prophecy, the encouragement of pursuing a college education was never provided.

While I was a junior in high school, I experienced the most severe sense of failure ever. Upon returning from Michigan,

I enrolled at the local high school. The adjustment went well that year until I was summoned to the counselor's office. He informed me that I had been taking the wrong history class and that I needed to change courses. This was very disappointing to me in that I had maintained an A average in the history class that I was enrolled in. However, I approached it positively as I accepted the fact that this was one of the drawbacks of being a migrant student. I anxiously awaited seventh period so I could meet my new teacher and do whatever needed to be done so that I could perform satisfactorily. Upon arriving to my seventh period class, my new teacher told me that I had lots of catching up to do. I was assigned ten chapters of American History on Monday, and was told to be ready to take a test on Friday since I needed to be at the same level as everyone else in the classroom. This was quite devastating to me and I began to feel quite pressured. I began to feel as if though school was not the place for me. This feeling had surfaced previously as my older siblings had all dropped out of school. To further add to the helplessness and the feeling of failure and inferiority, my grades began to suffer in the other areas as well. As a consequence, I made the decision not to come back to school. This was an appealing decision since I would be able to help my parents financially. The tradition in the family was to help the family out financially as much as possible since my parents did not have much education and relied on all of us to help out. When I made this decision, I conformed to the norm in keeping with the migrant dropout cycle which existed in my family.

I set out to look for a job and worked in the fields as much as I could. I was not very successful when I attempted to find a job.

The first question each prospective employer asked related to my level of education. It didn't take me long to discover that once people found out that I was a high school dropout, it gave them the license and/or authority to treat me less than human. They humiliated me and gave no hope of employment.

After putting up with much humiliation and embarrassment, I decided to try to obtain a high school equivalency diploma. The intent was solely for the purpose of finding a job and to deal with the rejection that I had already become accustomed to. I had previously heard of the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) at Pan American University and decided to enroll. Upon acceptance into the program I realized that I was given a second opportunity at an education. I knew that I would have to take advantage of it and work extremely hard. This was not hard to accomplish as, from the onset, plenty of encouragement was provided by the teachers, counselors, and administrators. It was obvious that the staff held high expectations of me and of every student. They kept telling us that we could achieve and continually provided the reassurance that we would be able to pass the GED test. In addition to an attitude that nutured a high degree of enthusiasm and motivation, teachers would help us with study skills, adjustment to an academic setting, and advised us on our areas of personal and academic strengths as well as exploring possible careers. The highly personalized instruction was structured in such a way that teachers epitomized on each of our successes so that we would feel good about each and every small accomplishment. This helped me develop a very positive self-concept. I felt good about my school work and about the possibility of graduating from the program.

I felt that I could not let my teachers down as they expected quite a bit from me and had invested much time and effort in preparing me for my test. I owed them and could repay them by showing to them that their expectations would be realized.

When the day of the test came, I approached it with great confidence. Once the results came back, I found out that I had scored in the top ten amongst my group. I felt proud of myself and, most importantly, came to the realization that anything is possible provided the right kind of positive external reinforcement is provided. I had received plenty of positive reinforcement in the program.

Upon graduating from the program, I, once again, set out to look for a job. It was a great feeling to tell prospective employers that I held a high school equivalency diploma. I was no longer humiliated by having to tell people that I did not finish high school. I found a job with a local freight company where I work as a freight clerk. It did not come as a surprise to me that my teachers from the HEP program kept in touch with me to see how I was doing. What did come as a surprise to me was that one of my teachers came to my place of employment one day and informed me that I could apply for a scholarship for college. She further told me that she and all the teachers at the HEP program had plenty of confidence in me and that I could do well in college. While I was in high school, no one had ever mentioned to me the possibility of my attending college or provided that type of encouragement. I had to let the thought ferment since I was being provided with an expectation that was never held of me

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

by any of my teachers in high school. After some thought, I decided to quit my job and accept a scholarship to attend Saint Edward's University in Austin, Texas through the College Assistance Migrant Program.

The decision to leave the Rio Grande Valley and my family to attend Saint Edward's University was not an easy one for me or for my family. However, I knew that once again, some very special people, including my parents and family, held high expectations and had plenty of faith in me. I could not let them down since they all wanted the best for me.

Once at Saint Edward's, I felt the same feeling I had experienced while at the HEP program. Counselors, tutors, and peer counselors were always available to provide the encouragement to continue. Much of the encouragement was provided in the form of tutorial sessions where adjustment problems were discussed as well as following-up on the application of study skills. The financial help provided by the program ensured that very basic needs were addressed so that our main emphasis would continue to be our studies. All these people and their actions and attitudes had a significant impact on my success in college and ultimately, my success in my profession and in life. Because of their continued and persistent encouragement, I graduated from the university with honors and the distinction of cum laude after four long years of hard work.

It is because of my experiences as a migrant youth and growing up in a disadvantaged environment that I decided to choose a career in the field of education. I chose to make it my goal in

life to work with children with similar backgrounds to those of mine so that I could provide them with very much needed encouragement and make a difference in their lives as many people made in mine. Cognizant of the fact that I am an exception to the cycle of dropouts, I continue my attempts to make a difference for children. As a successful elementary school principal, I am of the philosophy that all children can learn. I use my expertise as an instructional leader to impact those children who traditionally score on the bottom 25% of the norm referenced test. I am aware that these are the students who need to experience academic success or they too will become at-risk of dropping out of school. For these reasons, I have high expectations of my students and staff. I attribute my success in my career, however,to those people who touched my life in a very special way. It all started with the people at the HEP program at Pan American University and continued with the staff members at the CAMP program at Saint Edward's University. The expectations that they inspired continues to this day. While I have acquired a masters degree and am a successful school administrator, I realize the the sky is the limit. I have acquired some hours toward my doctoral degree and plan to continue to make a difference for disadvantaged children and am more than happy to serve as a role model for other migrant student to emulate. If I can make a difference in the life of one at-risk student by persuading him to stay in school or to reform a dropout, then the effort has been more than worth it. It is my contention that if my former high school teachers had the same kind of vision that the staff

held at both the HEP and CAMP programs, many migrant youth could have been spared from a life of poverty which is a result of the lack of success in school.

As you may see, the positive impact that both HEP and CAMP have had on my life has, as a consequence, impacted many other lives as well, the lives of the students I work with, and the lives of my family members. Since I was the first in my family to acquire a high school equivalency diploma, my two brothers who followed also finished high school and attended college.

As a successful product of both the High School Equivalency Program and the College Assistance Migrant Program, migrant education and, in particular , the HEP and CAMP programs, are very dear to me. I hold a special place in my heart for these programs since they have impacted many other lives as they did mine. I feel it is incumbent on me to serve as a role model to others whenever the opportunity arises. However, I also feel it is incumbent on this commission to acknowledge the successful outcomes of programs such as HEP and CAMP and to exercise whatever power or influence you may have, collectively or individually, to not only continue providing funding for these programs, but to continue to identify innovative and successful programs so that migrant education may continue to be enhanced and many more migrant students impacted.

Thank you.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you very much. There are very few chances that any of us have to say thank you to those who have made our lives better, except, perhaps, to do that same sort of thing for others. And I suspect that in that sense you've said "Thank you" many times over.

Our final witness this morning is John Jenson, who is President of the HEP/CAMP Association at Boise State University. Mr. Jenson?

Mr. JENSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure, indeed, to address this committee on behalf of the HEP/CAMP Association and the HEP/CAMP programs. I have been working with migrants for some time. In fact, I have something in common with the previous testifier in that I grew up in Northern Michigan and met migrants through my contacts in the cherry orchards of Traverse City, Michigan.

Migrant families continue to be among the most impoverished in the country. While health care has improved, the life expectancy of a migrant worker is still about 50 years. While the Federal Government and various organizations have sought to improve housing, our local paper described a situation where three families shared one small house.

Migrant children are still working in the fields often to supplement family income. I have been involved in this type of education for some time, and I am convinced that children of migrant and seasonal farmworkers remain the most educationally disadvantaged and at-risk of all of our nation's children. The dropout rates for these children is now estimated at about 65 percent. In 1972, it was about 85 percent. Chapter I migrant programs, indeed, are helping some of these children at the elementary and secondary level.

Today I really wish to testify about two outreach programs that have improved the lives of many, as noted in the previous testimony. HEP and CAMP students are assisted in overcoming cultural and language barriers and becoming successful students.

I am reminded of Juan Chavez. On our own campus, currently, he is receiving a 3.0 GPA in his freshman year of college. Yet, when he came to our HEP program, he could speak very limited English and struggled very hard. We weren't certain that he was going to make the passing scores on the GED exam, however, he had a great desire and commitment. When I interviewed Juan for CAMP program, that desire became very obvious.

I would like to just briefly describe some of the characteristics of our program. The programs were started under the Department of Labor in the early 1970s, then transferred to the Department of Education in 1973.

High School Equivalency Programs may be either residential or commuter, or in some cases both. Typically, the programs serve students 8 to 11 weeks in a residential program. Students receive direct instruction in large and small groups on the subjects required for the GED examination such as Math, Literature, and Social Studies, plus any other state requirements for an equivalent diploma.

In addition, the students receive instruction in life skills and career counseling and computer instruction. After completing their

programs, HEP students are assisted in finding postsecondary education placement or jobs.

In commuter-type HEPs, students may attend classes in the evenings after they have worked in the fields. These students may have young children of their own. Most of these programs are open entry-open exit, meaning students can enter at any time and test as soon as they are prepared.

Currently, there are 23 HEPs serving 3100 students in the United States. Success rates in these programs are about 80 percent, compared to about the 30 percent success rate of adult basic ed. So we know the success rates are phenomenal.

When one considers that many of the HEP students were unsuccessful in their high school careers or dropped out of their school due to lost credits and other state regulations—in fact, many have been pushed out of the schools. All are 17 years or older. The High School Equivalency Program received less funding this year than last, therefore fewer students may be served this coming year.

The College Assistance Migrant Program serves migrant or seasonal farmworkers or dependents by providing for support and assistance for their freshman year at postsecondary education institutions. In both HEP and CAMP, migrant or seasonal farmworkers must prove eligibility by showing the work record of 75 days in the past 24 months.

A typical CAMP program provides assistance in advising and scheduling classes, arranging students' financial package, and providing a strong support system. The support usually includes course work on how to become academically successful. The program assists with the adjustment to the college environment. Usually, the program provides tutoring assistance, most also have a mentoring program.

CAMP students must maintain a full load of at least 12 semester hours and meet the academic requirements of their respective institutions. Success rates for the freshman year in CAMP programs is about 80 percent. This is quite an accomplishment when one considers the typical retention of a freshman class at institutions of higher education is about 50 percent.

CAMP programs are helping students with limited backgrounds do very well in the competition on college campuses. We have about 70 percent retention into the sophomore year at my own institution. The institution is looking to us for leadership, in fact, in student retention. Given the athletic programs, I might comment that we're far above those rates also.

Currently, there are only five of these highly successful programs. Due to an increased appropriation from Congress, there will be six programs next year. However, the present programs will remain at level funding. All five programs are west of the Mississippi River. This year we are serving a total of 347 students, however in 1984, we served 710. This shows the drop in funding in appropriations for the CAMP programs.

Clearly, this population, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, are underserved. Most of our students would not be in higher education institutions, were it not for CAMP. The elegant testimony we just heard, I think, attests to that. Each program receives about 200 applications for the 40 slots we can actually use. Eastern HEP

programs are very concerned about the lack of CAMP programs east of the Mississippi River.

Yet, we continue to hear at the hearings conducted by the Commission on Migrant Education, testimony by teachers and administrators, like the one testifying today, how they were able to complete their degree due to the assistance provided by CAMP.

I would like to briefly turn to the recommendations of the HEP/CAMP Association for changes in Title IV in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. I would also note that these changes are supported, jointly, by the Interstate Council on Migrant Education and the National Association of State Directors of State Migrant Education.

The fist change is in the definition of eligible population. Here we are following the Federal Government's lead in promoting a common definition across Chapter I migrant and the JTPA programs. Basically, we're requesting an update in the language used in the Act to match that used in Chapter I and the migrant and seasonal farmworkers. One of the difficulties has been that people say that, "Well, I was in a migrant program, and now you're telling me that because of your definition you cannot serve us." And we have to say, "Yes, that is correct. Even though you may have been, indeed, in a secondary migrant program, you are not eligible for our program."

We also encourage cooperation among the identified entities to enhance services for migrant students. And we encourage TRIO programs, identified under Section 417, to recognize migrant student populations and seek these students' participation, and include migrant students as part of the eligible student population under Section 479C.

We are also encouraging multiple year funding. We did move under that last reauthorization from a 1 year cycle to a 3 year cycle. That has helped us really do a better job of networking and building our reputation among students, and also that network for seeking and recruiting students has been strengthened.

We also are recommending that there be more equitable geographic distribution. We think, indeed, there are needs for programs east of the Mississippi River, that are unmet.

We are also recommending an establishment of a National Mini-Corps which relates to both the outreach mission and early intervention. Basically, what we're suggesting is language that would allow the establishment of a mini-corps of former HEP and CAMP students to tutor students in their junior highs and middle schools.

It complements the HEP/CAMP program by beginning after the trainee has established him or herself in college. It maximizes the use of available talent by placing trainees in schools where they serve as aides and role models for other migrant children in migrant programs. And fourth, it stimulates a partnership between the state departments of education and local education agencies, and helps form a partnership.

In closing, I would like to note that we also oppose the Department of Education's recommendation on capacity building. I have thought carefully about this, and our Association has, indeed, discussed the capacity building idea as promoted by the Secretary of Education in testimony the other day.

My concern is this: in the High School Equivalency Program, most of these programs are housed at higher education institutions and are free of many of the local regulations, et cetera, and they have the flexibility to reach these students' needs, but there is no other motive for a higher education institution to take on this responsibility.

If we use the capacity building that is recommended by the Department of Education, I believe that institutions of a higher education may no longer operate these programs. So, I'm very concerned about capacity building in terms of HEPs, it is not a normal function of higher education institutions.

Secondly, regarding capacity building for CAMP programs, I think if you examine our record you'll find, indeed, that in our institutions for higher education, we are capacity building already. At Boise State, for example, any student entering our College Assistance Migrant Program from out of state is guaranteed out-of-state tuition waivers for the balance of his 4 years at the institution. At Saint Edward's, where Mr. Rodriguez graduated, they now have slots for 40 students, but 10 additional slots have been provided for their program through an anonymous donor to Saint Edwards, not only for their freshman year but for 4 more years.

So there is some capacity building going on. My concern about capacity building and only funding a program at a higher education institution for 3 to 5 years is that these migrant and seasonal farmworkers are not in the normal tracks.

You do not recruit these students in the normal recruiting vein. These students are recruited by going to the labor camps and out to the fields; that's where they're at. And one of the advantages of the present program is that it reaches out and recruits those students and brings people like Mr. Rodriguez to us, so that we can provide that kind of assistance.

Thank you, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of John Jenson follows:]

Testimony to Subcommittee on Post Secondary Education

Regarding recommendations on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 on behalf of the HEP/CAMP Association - Submitted by John H. Jensen, PhD, President

Congressman Ford and committee members, it is indeed a privilege to address this committee on behalf of the HEP/CAMP Association. Over the past 20 years, life of migrant and seasonal farmworkers have improved some, but not dramatically. In 1970, the US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued a Report called "Children at the Crossroads." This report on State programs for the education of migrant children under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education spelled out some of the characteristics of migrant families. While we have improved to some extent their education, health and housing, much remains to be done.

Migrant families continue to be among the most impoverished in the country. While health care has improved, the life expectancy of a migrant worker is about 50. While the federal government and various organizations have sought to improve housing, our local paper described a situation where three families shared one small house.

Migrant children are still working in the fields often to supplement family income. I have been involved in education about 30 years, I remained convinced that children of migrant and seasonal farmworkers remain the most educationally disadvantaged and at risk of all of this nation's children. The dropout rate for these children is now estimated at 65 percent. In 1970, the rate was about 85 percent. Chapter I migrant programs are helping these children at the elementary and secondary level.

Today I wish to testify about two programs that have improved the lives of many migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their dependents. These programs, the High School Equivalency Program or HEP and the College Assistance Migrant Program or CAMP, have impacted many lives and changed the lives of some of our brightest young people who were once caught in the web of impoverishment. One of our CAMP graduates will also testify so I will not take time to tell of our many success stories, though they are quite moving.

HEP and CAMP students are assisted in overcoming cultural and language barriers and becoming successful students. Juan Chavez is a good illustration. Currently, he is a CAMP student with over a 3.00 GPA. Yet, Juan came to our institution's HEP program with very limited English. However, he had a great desire to learn and has worked diligently to take advantages of resources and assistance provided by these two programs.

I would like to briefly describe the programs and their

characteristics. You may be aware that High School Equivalency Program was created by Noel Klaus and Ruth Graves in the Department of Labor in the Office of Economic Opportunity. Three years later the College Assistance Migrant Programs were created. The programs were transferred to the Department of Education in 1973.

High School Equivalency Programs may be either residential or commuter, or in some cases both. Typically the programs serve students eight to eleven weeks in a residential program. Students receive direct instruction in large and small groups on the subjects required on a GED Examination, such as math, literature, and social studies, plus any other state requirements for an equivalent diploma. In addition, students receive instruction in life skills and career counseling, and computer instruction. After completing their programs, HEP students are assisted in finding post secondary placement or jobs.

In commuter type HEPs, students may attend classes in the evenings after they have worked in the fields. These students may have young children of their own. Most of these programs are open entry - open exit; meaning students can enter at any time and test out as soon as they are ready.

Currently, there are 23 HEPs serving 3100 students. Success rates are 80% receive their GED, as compared to about 27% success rate in adult basic education programs. These success rates are phenomenal, when one considers many of the HEP students were unsuccessful in high school. They may have dropped out of school, lost credits due to state attendance regulations, or they may have been pushed out. All are seventeen years old or older. The High School Equivalency Program received less funding this year than last, therefore, fewer students may be served this coming year.

The College Assistance Migrant Program serves migrant or seasonal farmworkers or their dependents by providing for support and assistance for their freshman year at post secondary institutions. In both HEP and CAMP migrant or seasonal farmworkers of seventy five days in the past 24 months is part of the eligibility requirement.

A typical CAMP provides assistance in advising and scheduling classes, arranging students' financial package and providing a strong support system. The support usually includes course work on how to become academically successful. The program assists with the adjustment to the college environment. Usually, the program provides tutoring assistance. Most also have a mentoring program. CAMP students must maintain a full load of 12 semester credits and meet the academic requirements of their respective institution. Success rates for the freshman year in CAMP programs is about 80%. This is quite an accomplishment, when one considers the typical retention of the freshman class at institutions of higher education is about 50% CAMP programs are

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

helping students with limited backgrounds do very well in the competition on college campuses. We have had about 70% retention into the sophomore year at my institution, Boise State University. The institution is looking to us for leadership in student retention!

Currently there are only five of these highly successful programs. Due to an increased appropriation from Congress there will be six programs next year. However, the present programs will remain at level funding. All five programs are west of the Mississippi River. The majority serve 40 students. This year we are serving a total of 347 students. In 1984, we served 710, in 1985 440, and by 1987 we were down to 274 students.

Clearly, this population, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, are underserved. Most of our students would not be in higher education institutions, if it were not for CAMP. Each progrm receives about 200 applications for the 40 slots. Eastern HEP programs are very concerned about the lack of programs east of the Mississippi.

Yet, we continue to hear at the hearings conducted by the Commission on Migrant Education, testimony by teachers, administrators, and other leaders how they were able to complete their degree due to the assistance provided by CAMP.

I would like to turn to the recommendations of the HEP/CAMP association for changes in Title IV in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. I first wish to note that these recommendations are supported jointly by the Interstate Council on Migrant Education and the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education.

The first change is in the definition of eligible population. Here we are following the federal government's lead and promoting a common definition across Chapter I migrant and the JTPA progrm.

Definition of Eligible Population

A change in the eligibility definition used to identify, recruit and enroll migrant students is being proposed for the following reasons 1) to update the language used in the Act to match that used in Chapter I Migrant and the migrant and seasonal farmworker section of the Job Training Partnership Act; 2) to encourage cooperation among the identified entities to enhance services for migrant students; 3) to encourage TRIO programs identified under section 417 (Talent Search, Upward Bound, Special Student Services, and Educational Opportunity Centers) to recognize the migrant student population and seek these students' participation; and, 4) include migrant students as part of the eligible student population under section 479C which would enable these students, like their Native American counterparts, to exclude student's earnings from the amount computed for family

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

income.

Multi-year funding

One of the major problems facing programs funded under the Act for migrant students is the issue of how to maintain program continuity over a period of time. The goal of seeking to change the grant period form three to five years is the same as that raised in the last reauthorization of the Act. At that time the Committee changed the grant period for the HEP/CAMP programs from one to three years. The change has helped to stabilize the programs in several ways including establishment of long term goals, staffing, staff development, and opportunities for student follow through. The investment made by the federal government and participating institutions could be further secured by changing the grant period from three to five years.

Equitable Geographic Distribution

One of the concerns expressed by educators serving migrant secondary students is the lack of sufficient programs around the nation to meet the demands of eligible migrant students. This issue is discussed separately under funding needs. An additional issue related to the lack of a sufficient numbers of programs to meet demands is the need for equitable distribution of HEP/CAMP programs in various geographic regions of the country.

The intent here is not to redistribute the programs currently in place, rather, to recommend that as programs are made possible through additional allocations that the Secretary seek to establish "new" programs by an equitable geographic formula to ensure program availability in the principle migrant streams.

Establishment of a National Mini-Corps Program

Implementation of the Mini-Corps Program at the national level makes good sense from many different standpoints. First, from the student and family's perspective it provides the Mini-Corps trainee with an option to work and complete training to enter the teaching or related profession; this is not a give-away program. The Mini-Corps trainee works for a small stipend which helps the student as he/she works toward a degree. Second, it complements the HEP/CAMP program by beginning after the trainee has established him/herself in college. Third, it maximizes the use of available talent by placing the trainees in schools wherein they serve as aides and role models in migrant programs for younger children. Fourth, it stimulates partnerships between SEAs, LEAs, communities and institutions of higher education; Fifth, it maximizes the use of public monies by having the trainees assist in ongoing programs for migrant children and by using a model concept which has worked successfully in California since 1967. Additional resources would not have to be used to develop and test the model rather applicants could use the concept but tailor it to meet local needs. Sixth, as proposed

Mini-Corps would address many of the recommendations advocated by SHEEO, ECS and others to assist students throughout the "education pipeline" from kindergarten through college; Finally, the model would help to fill the need to encourage students to enter the teaching profession.

The Council recommends that the Committee consider adoption of the National Mini-Corps proposal as part of the programs included under Title V Part B--School, College, and University Partnerships. The Council is requesting that $15 million be allocated for this purpose. The rationale for this recommendation is that the State of California provided $4.3 million to meet their students' needs in the last fiscal year.

In closing, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the Department of Education's proposal for capacity building by their definition meaning one time awards to institutions of higher education. Quite frankly, we strongly oppose this recommendation. Even their own staff can not explain how High School Equivalency Programs would survive if their recommendation is put into place. Institutions of Higher Education would not normally take on this role, even though they have been highly successful. Generally, this turf is left to local educational agencies and local districts. Yet the mobility of the migrant population has led to real problems with local attendance policies, expectations, etc. In my judgement the environment of the IHE and resources it can provide is a major reason for program success.

The problem is somewhat different for CAMPs. In fact, the IHEs are building capacity and providing assistance beyond grant requirements. For example, at Boise State University, we waive out-of-state tuition requirements for not only CAMP students but also any former CAMP students. This costs Boise State University about $48,000 this year. At Saint Edwards University in Texas, they were able to secure the support of an anonymous donor who contributed enough to support ten additional students. Without federal support for CAMP, I would be very concerned about the recruitment. Normal channels do not reach this population. One must go directly to our fields and migrant camps to find these students.

Migrant and seasonal farmworkers play an important role in our nation's agricultural economy. HEPs and CAMPs allows us to return something to this most needy population.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you, and thank you to all of our witnesses for the quality of your testimony this morning. It will add, substantially, to our record. And I know that all of the members who have been here to hear all the parts of your testimony are grateful for it.

Let me start with a question. Mr. Saracino, you mentioned the success of the early intervention programs that NACAC is involved with. You also express support for the bills that Mrs. Lowey and I and Congressman Ford have introduced.

The President's recommendations for this reauthorization suggest that we consolidate a number of existing programs into one program. Could you tell us why you think there is need for additional early intervention programs, or do you think that we could accomplish these things through a single approach?

Mr. SARACINO. I don't think you could accomplish it through a single approach. I think that there are so many different ways to reach our youth, if you devise a program that's perfect for the migrant education population, you're surely, I think, not going to be able to include the programs for East Harlem. I think you need to definitely respond to the fact that there are many ways to reach the students. PACT is one model; there are a number of models.

One of the benefits, again, of SCAN is that it would make all of these programs available, through electronic media, to the communities throughout the country, and then they can take those programs that seem to work best with their students. So right now there is not one model that would best serve all.

Mr. SAWYER. Are there others of our witnesses who would like to comment on that? Ms. Martin?

Ms. MARTIN. With respect to the proposal concerning consolidation, I know that also included in that is to take some of the TRIO programs, be it Talent Search, Upward Bound, ELCs, I believe, and to consolidate them also into a precollege outreach program, and then putting them into a block grant situation going to the states.

Certainly, our position in the National Council, is that we are opposed to that view and that concept, primarily because you have the TRIO programs that have been in existence for 25 years, have proven their track record, and if you choose to consolidate these programs and then, perhaps, toss them back to the states, you may run the risk of, one, losing the experience that many, many years people on staffs have had running these programs.

You certainly run the risk of losing students with respect to the numbers of students that would be served by these programs. And certainly, given the economic situation, it certainly is questionable as to whether or not such block grants would, in fact, filter down to those individuals who are in the most need.

So my concern is that TRIO has proven itself over these many years, why would you take it and give it to someone else who, perhaps, has not proven that they can handle this kind of thing, and run the risk of, again, losing a number of students who well need what we're offering?

Mr. SAWYER. I'm not sure I would.

Mr. JENSON. Mr Chairman, I coordinate the TRIO programs for our campus, and I believe that you're in real danger diluting the quality through block grants. I have a real fear that it will become

a political process with the state Department of Education in the states, and that the fine programs we have will, in fact, not do as well.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you, that is helpful. Ms. MacDermott, what kinds of assistance can colleges and universities give directly to those who are providing counseling and guidance services, particularly at the middle school, which is a pivot point in decision-making, and in high school as well?

Ms. MACDERMOTT. Well, I think, predominately, the assistance that college and universities can provide is by becoming very proactive in that, along with the guidance staffs in the schools. We are frequently called upon to go into the school and to address those topics with students in classroom and group-type settings, because oftentimes the counselors and the teachers feel as though the students accept the information as having a little more credibility when it comes from a college person, and we are more than willing—that's one of the predominant ideas behind the Making High School Count project in Ohio.

A team approach has always served the students in the best way, I think. And that is the colleges and universities working hand-in-hand with the guidance professionals so that the teachers and the counselors who are involved on a day-to-day basis in the school, know the needs of that particular environment, can have the college person come in and supplement what they know is important.

Mr. SAWYER. One final question before I turn to my colleagues: Dr. Foley, you talked about the importance of targeting, and I certainly understand what you're saying. Why did you choose the particular target that you did, those who are already in school and under the age of 22, when, in fact, that demography seems to be changing so rapidly right now?

Mr. FOLEY. The particular reason for focusing on the under-22 was to address the very, very serious problem in New York—and which we believe is probably a serious problem across the rest of the country—and that's the dropout rate. In other words, what we're trying to do here with the combination of the partnership program—which is to give students counseling and mentoring so that they stay in school and actually do complete high school, and then with the goal of college, which would be financed through the scholarship program—is to stem this terrible dropout rate that we have.

Depending upon where you look, urban areas, rural areas, so on and so forth, the rate is disturbing. It's a terrible loss. It's an opportunity loss for the country in terms of students who do not complete their education. So the focus is to try to stem the dropout rate in the elementary and secondary schools.

In New York State, we have a separate program which is designed to provide financial aid for part-time students. As many people point out, the median age, for example, at City University in New York City is about 27 years of age. But the particular problem that we're focusing on here is to stem the dropout rate.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you.

Mrs. Lowey?

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to take this opportunity again to applaud you on your outstanding bill. I'm very

proud to be a cosponsor, and I look forward to working with you to be sure we have the best of all of our bills legislated, and to make sure that our youngsters take advantage of those opportunities. And I thank you.

And I want to thank this outstanding panel for your presentations today. In particular, I would like to address a question to Paula Martin. I couldn't help being very moved when you discussed or described the typical profile of a student in your program. And all I can think of was that that profile was a profile of a childhood of almost any inmate in our institutions.

When I have visited our institutions, the inmates have told me about how they got there. I've had several small sessions with inmates, and I kept thinking if we could have had 90 percent of them in your program or the programs that we're talking about today, how much money we could have saved in the long run, not to mention the lives that could have been saved.

Now, I wonder if you can comment on the cost of your program. We know that to keep one inmate in an institution costs upwards of $20,000 a year. I wonder if you can comment on the cost of your program per student. I believe you said your program has been in existence for about 21 years. Is there any follow-though done with the student? What kind of statistics do you have as to what these students are doing with their lives today?

This panel, certainly all of us who are here are with you 100 percent. And we have to send that message out, and we have to be sure that we get support from the Congress, and those kinds of statistics would be extremely helpful to us.

Ms. MARTIN. Thank you. First of all, there are two programs that we're operating, if you would, both of which are Talent Search. The middle school program is the newest of the two. We have been operating that only for 2 years now. And so we're actually, this year, looking at, if you would, our first class of graduating students from the junior high who will be going to the high school.

We do, however, plan to do some serious follow-up with these students in terms of the high schools that they will be going to, incorporating them into our regular high school Talent Search program, and providing them with continued support services as they go through their high school career.

But it does point out one of the very major differences between the Talent Search program as it's presently constituted and the middle school part of the Talent Search program, and that is that the Talent Search program primarily provides counseling and information dissemination, whereas now we have the middle school program that is providing the students with all these support services.

What we're looking at is working with 7th and 8th and maybe 9th grade students who are going to go into a high school environment and suddenly lose the support services that they had been receiving through the middle school portion of the Talent Search program. And so it is something, I think, too, that the committee or the Congress might consider in terms of the fact that as the programs are presently set up, there is not that continuity to continue the intensity of support services that a student might have, unless, of course, they happen to go into an Upward Bound program or

one of the other kinds of programs that continue to offer that kind of support service.

As far as our high school component, we do have statistics with respect to placement of our students. We have been successful in placing anywhere from 85 to 94 percent of our seniors or high school dropouts or, in fact, postsecondary dropouts who have come to our program for service in terms of getting college placement, financial aid counseling, and so forth, over the 14 year period.

In fact, we're now in the process of creating a data base to go back all those 20 years, if you would, to try to update what our students are doing, and how they've been progressing. We have many students who do come back during the course of the year for follow-up, and we do follow and track the students as far as we can, at least though 1 year.

But one of the other major problems that we do have is that we do not always have the resources to do an in-depth research and follow-up of students throughout their college-going career, or the personnel or the staff to do that. But to the extent that we're able, we certainly recognize that there is a need for accountability for the kinds of statistics that prove that, in fact, what we are doing is worthwhile and that these students are succeeding once they go beyond our programs.

But with the middle school program, we are in a position that we're dealing with a small enclave of students and will be able to track that throughout their junior high and their high school career and on into college.

Mrs. LOWEY. And after they graduate.

Ms. MARTIN. And after they graduate.

Mrs. LOWEY. Because I think that kind of information will certainly help us as we contrast, again, the cost of keeping an inmate in prison——

Ms. MARTIN. I'd like to speak to that cost. Right now our cost, if you cost it out, is that with the 50 students, we're spending about $1,000 per student.

Mrs. LOWEY. To save that life.

Ms. MARTIN. That's correct.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank you very much. Now, several of us have been talking about intervention, and yet, we have been focusing on different kinds of programs. Some of us are talking about information services to inform students of their financial options. Others are talking about counseling and mentoring to keep them in school and help them succeed. I wonder if any of the members of the panel here today would care to expand. Should we do one, the other, or both?

Mr. JENSON. I believe, in our experience, it should be both. With the CAMP program, we started originally with just a counseling component. By adding the mentoring component, we tie them to professionals, and they realize that when they tie to someone working in a bank, that computer class has real meaning. So, I think we need both.

Mrs. LOWEY. Would anyone else care to comment?

Ms. CHELIMSKY. I just wanted to mention, in particular, that I'm glad you asked the question, because I think it's important to be

46-807 0 - 91 - 5

precise about the intensity of the kind of intervention that we're talking about.

What we saw in some of the programs that we looked at were really extraordinary efforts. People staying after school every day for 3 hours, with five to six people helping, all summer, nights; this is a very extraordinary thing. I don't think we're used to talking about this kind of intensity of services and of efforts. And I think it's important to specify what we mean by the kind of extra efforts we want to talk about.

I think, certainly, that for the programs we saw, the sponsorship programs that I talked about, that effort was just absolutely instrumental in achieving the kind of retention and motivation and achievement that we saw in the students.

Mrs. LOWEY. I think that is a very important point, and I appreciate your comment on that. I mentioned that I've known Gene Lang for 30 years. Well, when he first initiated these programs, he was the counselor, he was the father, he was the mentor, he met with each of these students almost on a daily basis.

Ms. CHELIMSKY. Well, it's continued like that.

Mrs. LOWEY. And that's what was so special about the program. And this program has been replicated throughout the country, but clearly, not everyone is a Gene Lang. So I think your comments are very helpful.

Mr. SAWYER. You knew Gene Lang in grade school?

[Laughter.]

Mrs. LOWEY. Aren't you kind. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Andrews?

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank each of the members of the panel for testimony that was really inspiring this morning, and I appreciate it.

What I'm hearing as kind of a common thread here, is two propositions. One is that enabling students to move on to higher education, the kind of young people we're talking about, requires building both a technical bridge, that is getting information into the hands of the students, and an emotional bridge that convinces the student that we're going to send a very different message than we customarily send.

The customary message is, "You're not worth very much, and you're not going to make it." I mean everything in a lot of these children's environment tells them that. And we can rhetorically differ with that, but the message we're sending by the kind of housing we have these children living in, and the kind of crime we have them living in, is that they're not worth very much. And you have to overcome that emotional barrier.

The second thread that I hear running through this is that the time to do that is not the first semester of the senior year in high school. It is well, well earlier than that if we're really going to take hold.

It occurs to me that a key person in making these two things happen is a dynamic and committed counselor. Whether that person is in the school, in a nonprofit, in a church, some other kind of institution, that one of the key players in making this happen is a committed counselor, mentor-type person.

What kinds of things could we do to better compensate those individuals who are counselors, to liberate them from the more bureaucratic tasks that they very often have to engage in, and to attract some of our brighter and more motivated people to go into that field in the first place? What kinds of things could we do to put some of our all-stars into this kind of activity?

Mr. SARACINO. One thing you could do is let them counsel. The typical high school counselor, nowadays, has a case load of over 400 students in the public schools. It's very difficult for any meaningful counseling to go on when they're dealing with over 400 children and also doing attendance and other mundane tasks. So our counselors would like to counsel, but in many cases, are not able to.

Mr. ANDREWS. Maybe some of the corporate interests that have an interest in promoting education could help underwrite the cost of administration in the schools, or perform some of the administration and take that off the backs of the men and women who are supposed to be counseling, free up more time for them to do that.

Mr. FOLEY. If I could just interject, in New York State, with the Liberty Partnership Program, the partnership grants were on a grant-application basis. One of the things that made a grant more likely to be funded was if the grant applicant, which was a college or university, could demonstrate that they had corporate support, corporate involvement, community involvement, not-for-profit involvement, so that there was, indeed, a multiplier beyond just what the initial grant would actually pay for, so to speak.

And this multiplier effect, this leveraging—not only mentors from the private sector, but also mentors from students who were in college who would work with the students in junior high school and high school, students who had previously been through the program themselves, who could take their experience and, obviously, help students who are now going through it, and on and on and on, because you're constantly trying to get a multiplier, a greater benefit, from the one dollar in, so to speak, than that one dollar alone buys. And that, I believe, is one of the keys to this.

And the mentoring and counseling component is a critical component because many of these students are going through particularly difficult times during their early adolescent years, and they need that kind of support, such as Gene Lang did, personally, himself. And he'll tell you anecdotal things about getting phone calls at 11 at night and being on the phone with students to help them through a particularly difficult time.

That's not necessarily an academic problem, it's a personal family problem that that student may be having. But that's what has to be addressed at that point to keep the student on the road toward completing school.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you very much.

Ms. MARTIN. If I may comment also on your——

Mr. ANDREWS. Sure.

Ms. MARTIN. Also, to answer your question, Mr. Reed——

Mr. ANDREWS. I'm Mr. Andrews.

Ms. MARTIN. Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Reed is much younger and better looking and richer than I am.

[Laughter.]

Ms. MARTIN. I'll be sure to tell him that.

Mr. ANDREWS. It'll make his day.

[Laughter.]

Ms. MARTIN. Excuse me, Mr. Andrews, I think that in order to make the counseling more effective, you might think of things such as were done with teachers and also, I believe, with public health at one time, and that was to forgive loans for students who elected to go into those particular fields, whether they worked in an urban or rural or however it was liked to be defined as being "combat duty," if you would.

Also, if they had less paperwork and also better training—and by better training I mean better versed to multicultural diversity, kinds of training in which they have a full recognition and realization of all the various diverse groups that they may be encountering within the school systems or outside, and, certainly, from the point of view of a nonprofit organization, better funding, which would allow us to give competitive salaries that would attract the best in those areas.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Hayes?

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one question, I guess, directed towards the entire panel. I want to comment before raising the question that I certainly have benefited from what has been excellent testimony on the part of each of you.

Mr. Rodriguez, you've really been our role model, there's no question about it. What you've been able to achieve in life is certainly something that a lot of our young people could look at and profit from.

And to you, Mr. Jenson, with your Ph.D. When I looked at your testimony, I thought about the young person who's daddy had a Ph.D., too. When it was time to convince him to go to school, he didn't want to go to school. He had such a comfortable life not doing anything—working—and his daddy was taking care of him. His definition of Ph.D. was "Papa has dough."

[Laughter.]

Mr. HAYES. But just let me get serious a minute. I said I had one question that was directed to the whole panel, and maybe one question directed at you and Ms. Martin. I would like to know your reaction to what I see as a growing tendency to privatize the public educational system. Each of you have shown interest in the programs you work with directed towards access to educational opportunities, particularly to minorities and disadvantaged students who are so prone to drop out—which I am interested in too, trying to do something about it, and I understand it's up for funding if it hasn't already been done, the program for dropout prevention.

But the thing that bothers me is, as we look towards the efforts to talk about the voucher system and the parental choice system as it relates to our elementary and secondary schools, these are the feeder schools for the colleges and upper grade institutions you talk about, what do you see? Do you see the impact of this kind of institution, of this kind of program which is already being talked about in my own city, in Chicago—even the mayor, in his inaugu-

ral address, let out a little beep in this direction about taking a serious look at it.

Do you see the introduction of a program of choice of parental involvement of the voucher system increase any opportunity to kids who you say you're trying to help and trying to encourage to stay in school and guide them in the direction of preparing themselves for institutions of higher learning? Do you see this as being a detriment, lessening opportunity for poor and disadvantaged kids, particularly minorities, from getting the chance to go to a college and become useful in our lives in that respect?

And that's my question. Are you for or against it? I'll make it clear.

Mr. SAWYER. Who would like to take a stab at that.

Ms. MARTIN. I'll take a stab. In response to your question, Mr. Hayes, I think, myself, that there are certain dangers inherent within the concept of, if you would, the free choice or the tuition waiver kind of program. I think the inherent dangers are, one, that perhaps the privitization of education may be one way of passing the buck, if you would, from a Federal or a state or a local role to that of a private industry which also may not have any proven record that they can do it any better than those who have been doing it previously.

I don't think it represents any panacea, as far as having a solution to the problem. Even though the Eugene Lang program is an excellent program, they certainly recognize that there are certain drawbacks as far as support service and those kinds of things made available to students as a part of that program.

And finally, if there is choice, what guarantees will there be that all those students who want to have those choices will be able, in fact, to attend the schools they choose to attend?

And finally, one of the things that we've been discussing here today is: Does the information get out to the people who need to have that information? Mr. Sawyer's bill addresses that problem as far as a media campaign having to do with financial aid assistance, and I want to know what assurances there would be, if these things were enacted, that the information would be disseminated and gotten out to the people who need to know, and they are the low-income minority youth of this nation.

Thank you.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you.

Ms. MACDERMOTT. I would like to comment as well, if I may. This is an issue that has received a lot of discussion and controversy in the State of Ohio recently. And it has been part of a package of educational issues that have been discussed in our legislature.

I know very few education professionals, especially those in higher education, who are supportive of the idea. And there are a couple of concerns from our point of view that further reinforce what Paula has addressed. One is, we are very concerned about the potential labeling that will only be furthered by that kind of a choice system. We are all certainly realistic enough to know that that already goes on, and that people choose to live in certain places based on their knowledge of certain school systems. And we feel like a Choice program in Ohio will only further perpetuate that in a very negative sort of a way.

And the second concern that we have is that in some ways we see this as possibly being a mechanism to actually prevent reform and positive change in the Ohio schools, where it would create, instead, schools that simply develop reputations for being the better ones with the better tax base and the better programming, as opposed to the entire statewide system looking at how can it be better to serve the entire state population.

Mr. SARACINO. I think, really, what we believe is that it's a misdirection of time and energy and limited funds. The topics that we've been covering this morning are the issues that I think are going to make the difference in terms of increasing the ethnic diversity in our student population.

Early intervention is a topic that definitely has the broad support from both the public and private sector, from the secondary school and the university and college levels, there's no question that that is the area where we would like to see the limited resources and energy spent.

Ms. CHELIMSKY. I'd like to make a pitch for "let 100 flowers bloom." It seems to me that it would be wonderful to have state labs, as we used to have them, where not just the states but private people, everybody, was doing whatever they could.

The only thing that I would like to see is that instead of just spending so much time on touting how much has been done, much more was actually done, and in so many cases really is, because when you go to look at some of those programs, there's nothing there but a great deal of hype.

Mr. HAYES. The only other question I had in mind was directed towards Ms. Martin. I'm not quite clear as to how your middle school is funded.

Ms. MARTIN. Our middle schools program is funded—we have a Federal grant from the U.S. Department of Education as part of our Talent Search program, and we also went out and procured some private money to expand the program in terms of the number of students that we're serving. So right now our program is partly funded by Federal money and partly funded by private money. So we're serving 50 students through our Federal U.S. Department of Education grant, and we're serving an additional 41 students through private funding.

Mr. HAYES. Do you see it as part of the endangered species, given the direction that we're going in terms of accenting and emphasizing the need for education and constant pressures for reduction of our spending? Do you think your school can survive if the government backs away from these kind of programs?

Ms. MARTIN. No, quite frankly, I don't think it could. I think that even though there are private sources that recognize the need for early intervention and other kinds of educational endeavors, I don't think there's any way that the private sector could in any way make up for the Federal dollars that are supporting these programs on a national level. And we're talking on a national level as opposed to just the local level, where I was able to secure some additional money. That's not promised any more than what the Federal funds are promised.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FORD OF MICHIGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was interested in Mr. Saracino's comments as I came into the room. Back in the 1960s, when we passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we were looking at the kind of deficiencies that afflicted, in particular, school districts that were attended by large percentages of low-income children.

We were trying to target resources toward that type of population on a theory that there was a high correlation between the existence of concentrations of low-income people and the need for something more than what the local school system was doing for them. Most of what we were doing was to supplement and not supplant local effort.

One of the things that we were told was that children who did not have the good luck to have educated parents or older siblings with an education were kind of floating around in the system without any guidance. And if we expected these new programs we were creating to ever get to them, we had to do something to beef up a system of getting them the information.

So the Elementary and Secondary Education Act had a Title IV—and I think that's where she's talking about the state workshops—and then, later, there was a Title IV–C, in which we said specifically, "This money shall be used to provide academic guidance counselors in the elementary and secondary schools."

All of us have seen, as things tighten up in the local school districts, that among the very first people who go are the counselors. The counselors are eliminated long before the band director is eliminated, and the football coach never gets eliminated. And in some people's mind, as you run out of money, you end up with a few teachers in a classroom teaching what they still think of as the 3 R's.

We came along a few years ago with a President who had the idea of block-granting all kinds of things, let's put everything in a package and let the states decide how to spend it. And we found that when this counseling money got block-granted with a lot of other programs, it was right back where it started. It didn't enjoy local political clout that got any of that money going to counseling; it was all going to other things thought to be more worthy by the local people.

In my own case, I've never passed up a chance to talk to a counselor in my district and ask these questions: "How many children are you responsible for as a counselor?" I have a district that's 95 percent white, suburbs of Detroit. So this is not in the center of the city. It's not unusual for the counselor to answer 1,000 children at the high school level.

Then I ask, "How much time can you spend, either in a group setting or individually, talking to students about the availability of resources that are out there that might help them to go on with their education, either in college or in some other form of training?"

And what I get most frequently is, "Practically none. The office always has people waiting in my office who have got a drug problem. The police have put them on probation, and I've got to counsel them about what to do with a probation. The truant officer says

that they've been missing entirely too much school, and I've got to talk to them about that."

And actually, these counselors are really spending most of their time being probation officers. In the system that I grew up in, that's the job of the probation officer. Practically no time is left, except for a student who catches their eye and the extra effort is then generated by that, to really tell them about the availability of resources.

On top of that, at our Kansas City hearing, we had a young black man, who I recall as now being a senior in college, who went out and worked after he dropped out of high school because he grew up believing the only way that a black man ever went to college was if he played football or basketball. And since he was not that good at either one of them, he did not aspire to attend college.

After he started working, and after he had stood in front of a hot pizza oven through the summer in Kansas City long enough, he talked to some people who told him, "Why don't you go over to the school and talk to them?" And the school told him, indeed, there was some aid available. When he talked to us he quite proudly indicated that he was now a senior, fully expected to graduate, and had received $16,181 in Federal money that he didn't know existed until he got out in the world.

We asked the question: "When would it have been most likely that you would have paid attention if somebody tried to tell you that you ought to do better in school and stay in school because there is help waiting for you out there?" And he said when he was in the 6th grade.

Now, Mr. Sawyer, our acting chairman today, has a bill in to reconstitute a concentration on counseling. These are not sexy issues that get people all excited like Choice—whatever Choice means. I'm a little sorry that Charlie asked you that question, because I've asked the members of the committee to wait until we find out what Choice is before we kill it.

[Laughter.]

Mr. FORD OF MICHIGAN. Newspaper reporters are constantly asking us to construct Choice for the Administration and tell us whether it's good or bad. Well I can construct it—as Pat Williams likes to say, "I can teach geography of the earth either round or flat, whichever way you prefer." And Choice is just a nebulous word running around out there, and I hope we can get back to it when they finally decide what Choice is.

But this counseling question has been bothering people on this committee for some time. It also bothers people on our Appropriations Committee that we go to in order to get money for these programs. They say that when they're back in their districts, they don't find people who understand that these programs are for them. They think in terms of them being for somebody else, and they don't really fasten onto them.

So I'm a little suspicious that there's a whole pool of talent out there. The United Negro College Fund has one of the most gripping single-line themes, "A human mind is a terrible thing to waste." I'm afraid we're wasting a lot of human capital because that human capital never finds out that anybody wants to give them an opportunity to develop.

I just wanted to respond to you. You touched on a nerve here that's been jangling for some time; how do we go about getting more out of the bucks that we squeeze from the budget? And I was very happy to hear you make the generalization that you did. I wasn't happy with what it says, but happy to see that somebody else is seeing it.

Maybe either you, or GAO for that matter, could tell us where we've come since we block-granted counselors. How many kids are actually getting access to counseling at the junior high and high school level? Counseling 11th and 12th graders is pretty much a waste of time because the die is cast by then, unless there's an intervening factor like pregnancy or getting married or drugs. But as far as the academic thing is concerned, it's too late then to try to mold the dough into the shape you're going to bake it into.

But I have a suspicion that that simple act, for budget purposes and to make the Reagan budget look better, we've just about put ourselves back where we were before we started financing counseling. Do you know any place we could look to to find out whether this is a false hunch or whether it's valid?

Mr. SARACINO. We could come up with information for the committee very shortly, if you'd like, on that.

Mr. FORD OF MICHIGAN. I'd like to be able to rely on something more than my own questioning of people in my own area. Maybe we're just behind the curve.

Mr. SARACINO. There's no question that whenever there are cutbacks in the schools, you definitely see the counselors going first. Or when additional things are added on—you mentioned 1,000—that, in fact, is the district I grew up in, outside of Detroit—and that's not uncommon. But the average caseload is over 400 students per counselor.

What we're trying to do in many ways is dealing with the few counselors and mobilizing people to help, empowering the parents if there are parents, empowering the guardians, the school teachers, the case workers, whoever it takes to get to the students at an early age. And as you indicated, as everyone is hearing and discussing this morning, the earlier the better; there's no question. It's extremely frustrating for us at the college or university level to see someone who's a junior in high school who is way, way behind in terms of college prep courses.

So it's not uncommon at all for us to do more and more now with the middle school youth, to do programs that bring these children onto our campuses so that they can see that there is something for them besides playing football or basketball.

Mr. FORD OF MICHIGAN. Thank you very much.

Ms. CHELIMSKY. If I could just respond. We don't have national figures for you about counseling, but I can tell you that when we went all over the country asking people where they were getting their information from, if and when they got it, counselors were never cited. And what we learned was that their workload was so enormous; 400 was a common number that we heard. And I believe that you're absolutely right, I don't think there's any problem in making the statement.

Mr. FORD OF MICHIGAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you all very much for a wonderful discussion this morning that added enormously to the record on this subject and the way it effects so many others in the whole reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

If there's no further business to come before us, we stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

BILL SUMMARY

THE NATIONAL LIBERTY SCHOLARSHIP AND PARTNERSHIP ACT

Introduced on May 15, 1991

by Representative Nita M. Lowey

The National Liberty Scholarship and Partnership Act is designed to increase the numbers of disadvantaged youth who attend college by providing a combination of comprehensive early intervention services and a guarantee that cost will not be an obstacle to college attendance. It is based on innovative programs in New York State and elsewhere around the nation that have shown considerable promise in keeping students in high school and preparing them for postsecondary education.

The bill includes two basic components:

- National Liberty Partnerships -- A National Liberty Partnership program will provide matching grants to States for comprehensive early intervention and outreach services for at-risk youth. States will mobilize colleges and universities, schools, nonprofit organizations, and business groups into partnerships designed to provide comprehensive supportive services, including: skills assessment; academic, personal and family counseling; tutoring; and mentoring. An emphasis will be placed on keeping students in school and supplying them with the support and information necessary to prepare them for postsecondary education.

- National Liberty Scholarships -- A National Liberty Scholarship program will provide matching grants to States to provide an early guarantee of grant aid for college-bound youngsters from poor families. The Liberty Scholarship program will provide "last dollar" grant aid to students -- in addition to Pell grants and state grants -- to provide them with the full costs of attending an average public sector college or university in their State, including tuition, room and board, books, and other costs. This amount could be used for attendance at a public or private university. Essentially, this program will guarantee opportunity to all students by eliminating income as an obstacle to a college education.

Administration of these new partnership and scholarship programs will be modeled on the successful State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) program. Participation will be totally voluntary on the part of the States, and the federal government will match State contributions from public and private sources. In addition, considerable flexibility will be afforded to the States in designing their own partnership and scholarship programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

102D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 763

To establish a program to guarantee students from selected high schools a chance to go to college, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 31, 1991

Mr. FORD of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. BRYANT, Ms. LONG, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. WISE) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

A BILL

To establish a program to guarantee students from selected high schools a chance to go to college, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Chance to Go to College Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) many secondary school students and their parents are not aware of college opportunities early enough in their schooling to allow them to study and plan for their graduation from secondary schools and applying to colleges;

(2) many potential college students do not pursue college education due to an inability to finance large loans;

(3) it is necessary to increase college participation by all Americans, especially minorities, and to reduce the imbalance between grants and loans in financing a college education so that all Americans with desire and the ability have an equal opportunity to participate in postsecondary education and training, from the undergraduate to the postgraduate level, by the year 2000; and

(4) the United States, therefore, is challenged to—

(A) fully implement proven, cost-effective programs; and

(B) develop programs that derive from and expand upon existing successful programs.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

It is the purposes of this Act—

(1) to establish a demonstration project that will grant early intervention support programs and additional financial assistance to graduating high school students who wish to attend a postsecondary institution; and

(2) to determine in what manner the Federal Government can expand and increase existing programs such as Pell Grants, chapter 1 assistance, TRIO programs, in order to maximize the educational achievement of disadvantaged students.

SEC. 4. SELECTION OF HIGH SCHOOLS.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any eligible high school desiring to participate in the program under this Act shall submit to the Secretary of Education an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary requires.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to apply under subsection (a), a high school shall—

(1) be located in a school district for which the number of children counted under section 1005(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 exceeds 75 percent of the total number of children in such district; and

(2) demonstrate each of the following characteristics:

(A) the potential for parental involvement,

(B) an academic component including both tutoring and supplemental instruction,

(C) role model relationships or other support group interactions,

(D) guidance for selection of college preparatory courses before the start of the ninth grade, and

(E) assistance with the college application processes.

(c) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In selecting applicants, the Secretary shall give special consideration to schools which can demonstrate the support of private individuals or corporations or demonstrate current involvement with Upward Bound or other TRIO programs under part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(d) SELECTION.—From the eligible high schools submitting applications as required by this section, the Secretary shall select 50 high schools to participate in the program under this Act. Such high schools shall represent a broad base of both urban and rural sites.

SEC. 5. ASSISTANCE WITH ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

From 5 percent of the amount appropriated under section 9 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall provide financial assistance to high schools selected under section 4(d) to

offset the administrative costs to such schools of participating in the program under this Act. Such financial assistance shall be allocated on the basis of the number of students who are or may be qualified for assistance under section 6.

SEC. 6. SCHOLARSHIPS TO STUDENTS.

(a) ELIGIBLE STUDENTS.—For purposes of receiving scholarships under this section for any academic year, an individual is eligible if—

(1) such individual was a ninth grade student during academic year 1992–1993 in a school selected by the Secretary under section 4(d);

(2) such individual is enrolled or accepted for enrollment at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 1201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965);

(3) such individual qualifies for a Pell Grant under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of such Act for purposes of attending that institution.

(b) AMOUNT OF SCHOLARSHIP; RELATION TO OTHER AID.—

(1) MAXIMUM AMOUNTS.—An individual awarded a scholarship under this section may receive, for use during four academic years, a total amount of $25,000.

(2) YEARLY MAXIMUM.—During any academic year, the amount received by any such individual shall

not exceed the cost of attendance for such individual (as determined under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965) for such academic year.

(3) RELATION TO OTHER FEDERAL AID.—The amount of aid received under this section shall not be reduced by reason of the receipt by the individual of other forms of Federal financial assistance, but if the total of the aid received under this section and such other financial assistance exceeds the cost of attendance for that individual for that academic year, the amount of such other financial aid shall be appropriately reduced.

(c) INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.—If the amount appropriated for purposes of this section is not sufficient to provide scholarships to all eligible individuals in the amounts for which they are qualified, the Secretary shall reduce such scholarships in accordance with such equitable criteria and methods as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

SEC. 7. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE STUDY.

The Comptroller General shall undertake a study to determine what type of schools have benefitted from the program under this Act and to evaluate the program's impact on graduation and matriculation of students from the selected high schools. If the study demonstrates significant results, the Comptroller General shall determine what authorization

increases and adjustments, if any, should be made to the Pell Grants, TRIO, and chapter 1 programs to replicate these results nationwide.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

Terms used in this Act which are defined in section 1201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 shall have the meanings assigned by such section.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $25,000,000. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section are authorized to remain available for fiscal year 1992 and each of the 9 succeeding fiscal years.

○

I

102D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1524

To establish programs to promote increased access to higher education through early intervention counseling and financial aid information.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 20, 1991

Mr. SAWYER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

A BILL

To establish programs to promote increased access to higher education through early intervention counseling and financial aid information.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Student Counseling and Assistance Network Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Many students in the United States who, because of their family circumstances, economic status, or other reasons, do not have access to higher

education counseling or information on financial assistance programs, do not perceive postsecondary education as a viable option.

(2) For the well-being of the United States and in order to develop the full potential of each citizen, all students and their families must receive pertinent and thorough higher education counseling and information on the availability and extent of student financial assistance programs.

(3) Information on postsecondary education opportunities, with emphasis on precollege guidance and college admission counseling should be made readily available to school counselors, teachers, and school administrative staff.

(4) All schools and public libraries should have thorough and up-to-date information on financial assistance programs.

(5) Schools should have access to information on various types of precollege guidance counseling programs, including what programs have been successful in what environments, such as rural, suburban and urban, in order to fashion programs that are most beneficial to their community.

(6) Counselors, teachers, and principals in schools which have a low rate of students who con-

tinue on to higher education should receive extra training in precollege guidance and financial assistance opportunities, and especially in early intervention programs.

(7) Counseling and motivating students to strive for postsecondary education opportunities will have the added benefit of retaining more students in high school to complete the work necessary to obtain their high school diplomas.

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—From the amounts appropriated under section 8(a), the Secretary shall award grants to local educational agencies to use for the purpose of obtaining specialized training for guidance counselors, teachers, and principals to counsel students about college opportunities, precollege requirements, the college admissions procedure, and financial aid opportunities.

(b) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—

(1) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to those local educational agencies serving school districts (A) from which the proportion of students who continue on to higher education is significantly below the national average, and (B) in which the proportion of

students who are educationally disadvantaged is significantly above the national average.

(2) SELECTION PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall develop a formal procedure for the submission of proposals and publish in the Federal Register an announcement with respect to that procedure and the availability of funds.

(c) LOCAL PLAN.—To receive a grant under this section, a local educational agency shall submit to the Secretary a plan that—

(1) specifies the methods to be used for outreach, implementation, and follow-up with those students most in need and at-risk for dropping out or failing to pursue postsecondary education,

(2) demonstrates the methods by which the agency will target funds to those schools within the district that have the lowest rate of students who continue on to higher education;

(3) utilizes early intervention programs for counseling minority, economically disadvantaged, and at-risk students about postsecondary education;

(4) includes a strategy for keeping the guidance counselors, teachers, and principals who have been trained up-to-date on financial aid information;

(5) contains a statement of specific goals and methods for obtaining statistics on the number of participants who continue on to postsecondary education; and

(6) contains a description of the costs of the training and other activities to be undertaken.

(d) DURATION OF GRANTS.—Grants under this section shall be available for 2 years.

(e) EVALUATION.—

(1) CONDUCT OF EVALUATIONS.—The Secretary shall reserve not more than 2 percent of any amount appropriated under section 8(a) for the purpose of carrying out an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the training programs assisted under this section in—

(A) increasing the number of personnel in a school who regularly counsel students regarding college opportunities, precollege requirements, the college admission procedure, and financial aid opportunities; and

(B) increasing the number of students who continue on to postsecondary education from a school which has had personnel trained using monies from this section.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report which contains the findings of the evaluation required by paragraph (1).

SEC. 4. MODEL PROGRAM GRANTS.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—From the amounts appropriated under section 8(b), the Secretary shall award grants to develop model programs—

(1) to counsel students about college opportunities, precollege requirements, the college admissions procedure, and financial aid opportunities that are specially designed or customized for use in specific geographic, social, and cultural environments; or

(2) which stimulate community partnerships with schools by providing tutoring, mentoring, work experiences, and other services which support making postsecondary education a realistic goal for all students.

(b) PRIORITIES IN SELECTION.—The Secretary shall give priority to those model programs which are directed at areas which have a high proportion of minority, economically disadvantaged, or at-risk students.

(c) PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) TAILORING.—To receive a grant under subsection (a)(1), the proposal submitted to the Sec-

retary shall demonstrate that the counseling on college opportunities, precollege requirements, the college admissions procedure, and financial aid opportunities (including early intervention counseling), is tailored to a specific geographic environment.

(2) COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS.—To receive a grant under subsection (a)(2), the proposal submitted to the Secretary shall demonstrate the active involvement of at least one of the following:

(A) local businesses,

(B) labor organizations, or

(C) community groups.

(3) GOALS AND OUTCOMES.—To receive a grant under this section, each proposal shall contain a statement of specific, measurable goals and methods for obtaining statistics on the number of participants who continue on to postsecondary education.

SEC. 5. DIFFUSION NETWORK ACTIVITIES.

(a) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall collect information concerning—

(1) successful programs which counsel students about college opportunities, precollege requirements, the college admissions procedure, and financial aid opportunities;

(2) successful early intervention programs which set students on the path toward staying in school and pursuing a postsecondary education;

(3) model programs which counsel students in specific environments, such as urban, rural, and suburban; and

(4) model programs which develop school/community partnerships to provide mentoring, tutoring, work experiences and other services which support making postsecondary education a realistic goal for all students.

(b) DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall insure that the information collected under subsection (a) be disseminated through the National Diffusion Network.

SEC. 6. DATABASE AND INFORMATION LINE.

From the funds available under section 8(d), the Secretary of Education shall award a contract to establish and maintain—

(1) a computerized database of all public and private financial assistance programs, to be accessible to schools and libraries through either modems or toll-free telephone lines; and

(2) a toll-free information line to provide individualized financial assistance information to parents, students, and other individuals.

SEC. 7. PUBLIC ADVERTISING.

The Secretary shall encourage private nonprofit agencies and organizations to work with persons engaged in video production to develop and deliver public service announcements and paid advertising messages that encourage economically disadvantaged, minority, or at-risk individuals to seek higher education, and to seek higher education and financial assistance counseling at public schools and libraries. The Secretary shall keep the appropriate committees of the Congress informed with respect to the efforts made pursuant to this section and shall recommend any additional legislative authority that will serve the purposes of this section.

SEC. 8. ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY.

(a) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) APPLICATIONS.—Such regulations may—

(1) require the submission of applications for grants and contracts under this Act that contain or are accompanied by such information or assurances as the Secretary may require to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(2) specify the time at which and form in which such application shall be submitted; and

(3) require such reports or information as may be necessary to carry out such purposes.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years to carry out section 3.

(b) MODEL PROGRAM GRANTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years to carry out section 4.

(c) DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES.—There are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years to carry out section 5.

(d) DATABASE AND INFORMATION LINE.—There are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years to carry out section 6.

SEC. 10. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

(2) The term "local educational agency" has the meaning specified in section 1201(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

O